CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the PACIFIC LIBRARY

THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 10. JANUARY, 1937. Vol. XXVI.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

The Primate's New Year Broadcast.

The Primate's New Year Broadcast published in full in the Times of December 28th, 1936, expresses what is in the hearts and minds of many. It is an appeal for the revival of the religious life both in the individual and in the nation. It may be summarized as follows :

> There is urgent need 'to re-found our life, personal and national,' on the principles of the Christian religion. The need for this re-foundation is due to the drift away from religion in modern life, and this drift is due to the spirit of materialistic science and to the increase in the pace of living. These things have tended to weaken morality and crowd out religion. Much moral and religious feeling yet exists in the hearts of the British people. It is critical, impatient, sincere and perhaps more widespread than ever before, but it is vague and formless. The need to-day is that this vague and formless emotion should be canalized and express itself in definitely simple and sincere private prayer and regular dutiful acts of public worship in God's House. Prayer, however, must be combined with practice. Each should strive by his daily conduct to reflect Christian principles. To do this will be to re-build our personal life and our national life 'upon a rock.'

No one who, on the one hand, is a loyal lover of the British people and, on the other hand, a sincere believer in those moral and spiritual foundations upon which alone a permanent, sound and progressive civilization must be based, can feel anything but sympathy with the Primate's appeal. What perhaps may be questioned is the effectiveness of that appeal. It is not words on the part of Church dignitaries but actions which are needed to-

day, or rather a Church policy which in practice is commending itself to the good will and good sense of the nation at large. The Church has not yet implemented that policy. We venture to give one example of this. In the very month in which the Primate delivered his New Year appeal to the nation he publicly declined as Visitor to restrain the introduction of 'Mass vestments' into Canterbury Cathedral. As Modernists we are unable to take sides in the Vestiarian controversy which has done such injury to the English Church, but we are certain that for great numbers of English people the 'Mass vestments' are regarded as outward and visible signs of the Romanizing of the English Church and for a Romanized English Church, English people have no use whatsoever. It is perfectly vain to invite them to return to their parish churches to worship God there whilst these repellent novelties are practised there. Yet these disgruntled parishioners and their children are, for the most part, not frequenting any other place of public worship but have joined the increasing multitude of those who have discarded the public worship of God. The Church authorities have allowed this pestilential controversy to drag on, decade after decade. The only remedy is to give the parishioners control, and to prohibit any alteration in the character and time of the public services which has not the consent of at least three-fourths of the parishioners.

If the general public knew that the decisions in such matters lay with the parishioners, and not with the clergy, and that it was the congregation which wished to have things as they are, much of the harm that is being done to public worship by these changes would be prevented. The existing feeling in the public mind is, that it is the clergy who are responsible for these novelties, and that it is the clergy who have forced them upon an unwilling and outraged laity. Hardly anything could be more detrimental to the popularity of public worship than the prevalence of this widespread conviction. It is this clerical tyranny that has deprived the laity of the services to which they believe themselves to be entitled in their parish churches, which has been an important factor in the drift of many people from the public worship of God and in the outward practice of religion, of which the Primate complains.

But this is only one of many factors in the present Church

situation. That situation is really due in no small degree to the cleavage between lay religion and clerical religion. Clerical religion has been steadily growing in influence within the English Church and has, as a consequence, led to lay religion deserting the Church. Clerical religion is strongly sacramentalist and sacerdotalist. Lay religion, as a whole, is neither. Rightly or wrongly its Christian ideals to-day are those of the Sermon on the Mount, in which document neither priests nor sacraments find a place. What kind of public worship English lay religion values can easily be discovered by observing the kind of services it maintains; it may be in the Inns of Court, Public Schools, P. & O. liners, B.B.C. broadcasts or in any other place where the layman has control. When the Primate concluded his earnest address by exhorting the nation to re-found their personal and national life on a rock, he was referring, as the context shews, to the concluding words of the Sermon on the Mount. If the Church of England were to seek to re-found its life on that rock and would cease to stress its ecclesiastical, sacramental, sacerdotal ceremonial activities, it would be doing much to procure a return of multitudes of ordinary men and women to its worship and leadership. It is the English Church, divided, decadent, deserted, which, much more than the nation, is in dire need of re-founding its life upon the Rock of the Sermon on the Mount.

Perhaps the most perplexing problem with which religious Englishmen are faced to-day is whether if the Church of England continues to become steadily weaker and less effective, it will be possible without that Church's agency to keep alive the Christian spirit in the life of the nation. Yet to create a new Church would entail the disestablishment and disendowment of the present Church of England. There are indications that we are hastening towards the brink of that precipice and some of our ecclesiastical leaders are forcing the pace. Romanism, Secularism and Sectarianism watch the situation with interested eyes, but neither Romanism nor Sectarianism, although they think otherwise, have anything to gain in this country from the collapse of the Church of England. Secularism would gain, and with its triumph the progress of our civlization would cease in this land.

THE DARK AND THE BRIGHT SIDE: 1802—1937.

No one can read again Wordsworth's Sonnets written in 1802 without feeling the aptness of some of their phrases to describe the present moral and spiritual condition of our nation.

> Plain living and high thinking are no more:
> The homely beauty of the good old cause
> Is gone: our peace, our fearful innocence,
> And pure religion breathing household laws.
>
> Milton! thou shouldst be living at this hour:
> England hath need of thee: she is a fen
> Of stagnant waters: altar, sword, and pen,
> Fireside, the heroic wealth of hall and bower,
> Have forfeited their ancient English dower
> Of inward happiness. We are selfish men:
> Oh! raise us up, return to us again:
> And give us manners, virtue, freedom, power.

Yet anyone who will study the England of that period: the exploitation of its labourers and factory workers, its child-slavery, the cruelty of its criminal laws, its political corruption, its appalling insanitation: the condition of its prisons and lunatic asylums: the barbarity of its public schools, its subjection of women, the tyranny of the landed classes, and so on, will feel profound reason for hope and thankfulness when he compares those conditions with the conditions that prevail to-day.

The Christian religion did play, and particularly through the Evangelical Movement, led by its saints, William Wilberforce and Lord Shaftesbury, an important part in the wonderful reforms which followed, but those reforms were (with the exception of Dr. Arnold's great reform of the Public School system) carried out by Parliament. It is the amazing part which Parliament has played as a reforming, uplifting, inspiring, philanthropic power in our national life during the last century which is something for which we can feel increasing gratitude.

Sir Arnold Wilson, the distinguished editor of the *Nineteenth Century*, when speaking recently at Manchester on the theme, 'A social revolution or a religious reformation,' took occasion to point out the falseness of this antithesis. The *Manchester Guardian* cites him as follows:

> 'Sir Arnold, pointing out that the title of the debate demanded a clear-cut decision between two alternatives, argued that they could not have one without the other, and expressed the opinion that there had

been in England in the past hundred years a religious revolution which had brought them nearer to the two great Commandments to "Love the Lord, thy God," and to "Love thy neighbour as thyself." He believed that religion must always be at the back of the social reformer.

'There has been a social reformation because of a religious revolution. We are more charitable. We do not take the severe view we did of offences against the law. Sentences are more lenient, and, although we are fifty years behind the times in our treatment of prisoners, we still believe that kindness is better than cruelty.

'We are more reasonable in our attitude towards marriage. We are far more reasonable in our care of the insane and the sick. Our Poor Law is more humane. Our attitude towards children is essentially the Christian attitude. Therefore I should vote for a further instalment of the religious reformation, because it is at work in our daily life. Parliament is moved by a truly religious spirit in its attempts to apply, so far as is practicable at any given moment, the ideals of any given folk.'

We could wish that in their public utterances our Church authorities would exhibit more consciousness of this amazing parliamentary record with a becoming humility with regard to the Church's record, in comparison with it, during the same period. Moreover, it is to the Church's prophets, whether clergymen or laymen, and not to the Church's official assemblies and organizations, that the nation owes so much. But we may ask: What has been the attitude of Church officialdom towards these Christian prophets and reformers? Apprehension, condemnation, neglect. It was not of F. D. Maurice, Thomas Arnold, Robertson of Brighton, Benjamin Jowett, Bishop Colenso, that John Henry Newman was thinking, but of himself and his Tractarian friends, when he framed that tremendous indictment against the official Church of England, pronounced in his last sermon, delivered from the pulpit of St. Mary the Virgin, Oxford, before entering the Church of Rome.

'O my mother, whence is this unto thee, that thou hast good things poured upon thee and canst not keep them, and bearest children, yet darest not own them? why hast thou not the skill to use their services, nor the heart to rejoice in their love? . . . Thine own offspring, the fruit of thy womb, who love thee and would toil for thee, thou dost gaze upon with fear, as though a portent, or thou dost loath as an offence; at best thou dost but endure, as if they had no claim but on thy patience, self-possession, and vigilance, to be rid of them as easily as thou mayest. Thou makest them "stand all the day idle," as the very condition of thy bearing with them; or thou biddest them be gone, where they will be more welcome . . . And what wilt thou do in the end thereof?'[1]

[1] *Sermon bearing on subjects of the day.* 'The Parting of Friends' (p. 461).

Economics, Politics and Christian Ethics.

The following Manifesto which appeared in the *Times* of December 16th, 1936, deserves serious attention. It was signed by the Archbishop of York, the Bishop of Carlisle, the Dean of Rochester, Professor C. E. Raven, Dr. Scott Lidgett, Dr. S. M. Berry, Dr. Maude Royden, Sir Francis Acland, M.P., Mr. Harold Macmillan, M.P., Miss Margaret Bondfield, Dr. J. C. Maxwell Garnett, Mr. Angus Watson, Mr. Arnold Rowntree, Professor J. L. Stocks and Mr. Henry Brinton.

As we consider the world in which we live, we are impressed on the one hand by the possibilities of material well-being which result from man's conquest of nature and have made poverty an anachronism. On the other hand we see that conflict has robbed us of the fruits of victory. Economic conflict is extending to political conflict, taking the form of a bitter struggle between extreme Right and extreme Left which threatens to extend still further to a general war. This would delay for an incalculable time any opportunity to profit from the application of modern science to production and distribution.

Those who put their trust in violence as a political method have been encouraged by recent happenings. Those who trust in reason are becoming disillusioned and cynical.

We believe that this dangerous and disastrous state of affairs is due to the failure to apply to the affairs of this world the teachings of Jesus Christ.

We believe that the only solution of our difficulties now is to apply, even at this eleventh hour, the principles of Christianity to our political problems, both domestic and international.

We recognize humbly that the failure of the world to turn to Christ is largely due to the manner in which His teaching has been presented to the world by His Church; to the pitiful display of disunity and discord which His followers have given; and to the fact that at times sections of the Church have been actively associated with policies and régimes that have been obviously irreconcilable to the spirit of Christ. We acknowledge that in these ways the Christian claim upon the world has been blunted in its appeal.

We recognize with thankfulness that during recent years strenuous efforts have been made both at home and oecumenically by the Churches to explore, emphasize, and express the social obligations and aspects of their faith, and would urge upon all Christian people the importance of such work as is being undertaken by the Faith and Order and the Life and Work Movements.

We further recognize that before we can expect the world as a whole to accept the full doctrine of Christianity, it has the right to expect of us that we shall show the relevance of the way of Jesus to the affairs of the community.

Yet we repeat with confidence that the effort to conduct human affairs without reference to Christian principles is precisely the method which has brought the world into the present morass.

A very large proportion of the political and economic dangers which threaten us are directly attributable to the un-Christian manner in which we treated our enemies of the Great War. One of the most

profoundly important lessons of modern history is to be learned from a comparison of the effects of our treatment of South Africa after the Boer War and of Germany at Versailles.

We hold that the expression of Christian principles in the political sphere must take a democratic form, because this alone does justice to the Christian conception of man. Reverence for personality in every human being at once expresses and safeguards belief in and loyalty to the divine sovereignty which is superior to every earthly judgment. It involves Government by discussion and the free play of reason; consequently it involves also respect for minorities, while it demands of minorities acceptance of decisions constitutionally reached until they can be constitutionally changed. It involves the application of the same principles to the relations of nations to one another, so that they live together as members of one family. It involves the securing to every man of his fair share of leisure and of work, and equipment for the effective use of both.

We believe that democracy can be a mere welter of competing self-interests, which is justly condemned. But we believe also that it can be the political expression of the Christian spirit, and that only through it can that spirit be fully expressed.

We believe that the immediate and practical step to take is to stimulate and provide for the study of economic and political questions in the light of basic Christian principles. We hold that such study should be carried out by all those who accept the fundamental Christian ethic, and will welcome the co-operation of all such — whether they be members of a Christian congregation or not, and whether they accept the full gospel of Christ or only hold that 'in the life and teaching of Jesus of Nazareth there is presented an ethical truth which can save the world.'

We therefore invite all those who are in general agreement with this statement and who are willing to take part in a movement for translating Christian ethics into action on democratic lines to communicate with us. Donations will also be gratefully received for carrying out the work which we have proposed. Expressions of interest or donations should be sent to Henry Brinton, 11 Graham Street, Eaton Square, S.W.1.

This Manifesto, which is very sound as far as it goes, fails in two directions. First the economic, racial, and political problems with which humanity is faced to-day are immensely complicated and overwhelmingly difficult. A vast amount of scientific research, technical skill and practical experiment is needed for the solution of these problems. It is not the benevolent amateur but the highly-trained specialist who is needed to lead humanity through the Wilderness into the Promised Land. Certainly everything that man's moral consciousness and spiritual intuition can offer is equally needed. Those who have some experience of the complexity and the difficulty of the practical problems involved are apt to become impatient with those who seem to think that only good will and the application of Christian prin-

ciples to our economic racial and national problems is sufficient to solve them all. This aspect of the matter is stressed by Mr. Marcus Samuel, M.P., in a letter to the *Times* published on New Year's Day, in which he made large use of the convictions of Sir Josiah Stamp.

> In this connexion I deem it not untimely to call attention to a lecture delivered by Sir Josiah Stamp in 1926 entitled 'The Christian Ethic as an Economic Factor.' The purpose of so doing is to rebut the dangerous fallacy inherent in that manifesto which, if it gains widespread acceptance, can only result eventually in a terrible disillusionment.
>
> Perhaps the following extracts from the lecture will make clear its tenor and encourage recourse to its text:
>
> 'I have noticed that the fervent and convinced statement on the platform that if only a spirit of universal brotherhood prevailed the problems of men would all be solved never fails to raise audible and enthusiastic assent. But such a statement is not merely woefully wrong in its emphasis; it is also mischievous, because it dopes men's minds till they cannot see what action is really necessary, still less rise to action.
>
> 'Christian enthusiasts, desiring to remodel economic society, and offering prescriptions for it, need to devote a little less effort to the elaboration of Christian principles, and a little more to patient analysis and study, not of superficial social appearances and formations, but of underlying economic principles.
>
> 'The common assumption so tacitly made, that there is an accepted body of Christian ethics ready to be turned to any problem, is not justified.
>
> 'The injunction on all hands that Christian principles must be made to prevail in industrial and social life seems to me to raise certain presumptions without duly weighing them.
>
> 'There is nothing in ethics which can *compel* a given territory and organization to support a population of a particular size at a particular level of existence, though much current discussion seems tacitly to assume that if enough moral indignation is aroused the miracle can be worked.
>
> 'Suppose you find, on analysis, that high qualities of leadership and co-ordination are *essential* to such production as will maintain a vast population on present lines. How are such qualities to be enlisted? . . . The process of competition, and the survival of the fittest, is pretty ruthless, and doubtless makes blunders; it often seems to be irreconcilable with Christian ideals. But it produces some leaders and captains of industry. Dare we assume that choice by Christian virtue or by a call by the motive of service and not profit, will automatically select leaders as efficient economically?
>
> 'I think you might manage to agree voluntarily upon a non-economic but ethical scheme with more measure of success in a small-scale village industry with self-contained direct relationships of not more than two removes between purchaser and consumer, between director and directed. But such a scheme of society must hopelessly fail to provide a decent standard of life in these islands for 46 millions of people, and I doubt if more than half could actually remain alive.'

To me it seems a most cruel and unfair thing to raise the hopes of large sections of the community that their conditions will be improved unless there is some certainty of those hopes being fulfilled. And when the specific recommended in so facile a fashion for this purpose may conceivably worsen those conditions by reason of the inevitable working of economic laws (if we are to believe a foremost authority on their operation), then indeed I for one tremble for the people and echo his words, 'Let us remember that evil is wrought by want of thought as well as want of heart.'

I am emboldened to write this letter as one of those appealed to by the manifesto who recognize ethical values of a Christian character.

A second difficulty is to secure agreement among Christians themselves as to what these Christian principles are. For some very notable Christians in England to-day, Non-resistance is a Christian principle: for others it is not. For some, Communism is a Christian principle: for others it is not. For some, equality is a Christian principle: for others it is not.

It is this difficulty of securing agreement among Christians in the sphere of Christian ethics which must be also taken into account. Intelligent, open-minded and strenuous investigation by bodies of student-Christians cannot fail to be of service, provided that the exceedingly exacting character of the study be recognized. A chaplain of the Senate of the United States said at the close of last century: 'The century which is now ending will be known as the age of the mechanical forces: that which is dawning will be known as the age of the moral forces.'

An Experiment in Reunion.

The following paragraph from the *Church Times* of December 18th, 1936, described an experiment in reunion.

The Rev. Cuthbert Paul Gliddon, vicar of St. James', Walthamstow, has, with the approval of the Bishop of London and the Bishop of Chelmsford, accepted the call to be priest-in-charge of King's Weigh House Church, in association with the Rev. E. J. Alcock Rush, who has carried on the work for the past four and a half years, and who is seeking Anglican Ordination at the hands of the Bishop of London.

Thus after twenty-two years of service for reunion, this well-known church and its ministry enters into communion with the Anglican Church, retaining its present Constitution and largely its usual forms of worship.

One of the most interesting features of this venture lies in the fact that the new chaplain has received promises of co-operation from leading Anglicans, of differing outlooks, such as the Rev. R. S. Eves, vicar of St. Albans, Holborn, and Canon H. R. L. Sheppard, of St. Paul's Cathedral.

The Catholic Sacraments will be administered only by priests whose Orders are approved by the Bishop of the diocese; but, inasmuch as the King's Weigh House has always endeavoured to provide a centre of unity, the pulpit will be open to all preachers, whether Anglican or Nonconformist, who are deeply distressed at the present disunity, and see in the work of the King's Weigh House a hopeful step towards the rebuilding of Christendom.

Among Nonconformists who have already declared their willingness to preach under the new arrangement are the Rev. Edward Shillito, the Rev. Frederick C. Spurr, and the Rev. Donald Soper.

Should this experiment prove really successful, it may be expected to have widespread repercussions among the Sacramentalists in the Free Churches. May we not also hope that it will seriously influence in a liberal direction the use which is being made of our great cathedrals as centres of national religious worship and Christian education. What Liverpool Cathedral was built and endowed to achieve every English cathedral should aim at becoming.

PERSONAL MATURITY AND RELIGIOUS BELIEF

By James W. D. Smith, M.A., Ed.B.

WHAT part does religion play in the growth of personality? Does it promote maturity or retard it? Many psychologists would claim that emotional maturity and religious belief are incompatible terms. Freud and his followers, for instance, regard religion as a neurotic symptom, a way of escape from reality. Other schools of psychology are less openly critical of religion, but they discuss personal development without explicit reference to it. Adler refers from time to time to 'religiosity' as a common accompaniment of maladjustment, and in one of his books he suggests that it is only when men have suffered defeat that they ask questions about the meaning of life, but for the most part he ignores religion altogether. Even when he is discussing the subject directly in an essay on psychology and religion[1] Adler preserves a cautious and aloof attitude.

[1] Jahn und Adler, *Religion und Individualpsychologie*.

It is not difficult to see why psychologists are shy of referring to religion explicitly when discussing personal development. Religious phenomena are so diverse and the language of religion is open to so many different interpretations that it might be difficult to avoid misunderstanding. And there is a more serious difficulty. Psychology is governed by the scientific ideal and science does not meddle with ultimate questions. Religious experience is a fit subject for psychological investigation, but consideration of the place of religious belief in personal development raises questions which lie outside the field of psychology.

But religion cannot be ignored in discussing personal development. Religious belief may take many forms, but religious issues lie so close to the heart of life that adjustments which may properly be called religious would seem to play an essential part in the attainment of personal maturity.

Adler speaks of three main tasks which face the individual in his progress towards maturity. Economic necessity forces him to find an occupation. The social circumstances of life make it necessary for him to come to terms with his fellows. And the biological urge which perpetuates the race cannot safely be ignored. It is in these basic relationships of life, occupation, society, sex, that a man's character is forged. Success in these relationships is the condition of maturity. Adler does not mention religion nor suggest that life has any meaning which cannot be discussed in purely naturalistic terms.

This is surely a short-sighted view. If we think of life in purely natural forms defeat is the lot of us all. There is an obvious insecurity about the natural life of man. A man may win success in his chosen profession, he may move at ease in the world of men and he may be happily married, but at any moment the angel of the Lord may say, 'Thou fool, this night thy soul shall be required of thee.' Death is a central fact of human experience, and personal maturity is impossible without satisfactory adjustment to it.

If man were a creature of instinct alone the question of his attitude to death would not arise. Animals do not fear death. Only man has reached the level of mental development at which awareness of death plays a part in experience. That part may be

small in youth and early manhood. When the vital forces of life are strong, circumstances favourable, and the mental life comparatively undeveloped, its influence may be negligible for the greater part of life. But these vital forces must lose their strength, and the second half of life faces man with a prospect which it becomes more and more difficult to ignore. It does not follow that a belief in personal immortality is now essential. It is possible to argue that wisdom consists in accepting the biological view of life and death. Individual life completes its cycle of fruition and decay, but life itself persists. We have our brief moments of personal consciousness, but we must be content, in due course, to sink again into that stream of life from which we came. But it does follow that adjustment to the fact of death must be made. Quiet acceptance of death in this fashion — or in any other — requires a higher level of self-consciousness than most people attain. But death is an inescapable fact of human experience, and adjustment to it must surely be regarded as a condition of true maturity.

The teaching of C. G. Jung is of interest at this point. In several of his books he dwells on the importance of religion in human life. His general position is that the great religious systems of the world embody agelong human experience of the art of living and therefore have permanent significance. The great religious myths — like the death of the hero — which appear under different forms in different religious systems, are concrete projections of inner problems and adjustments. In an essay published in the collection entitled *Modern Man in Search of a Soul* he says :

> 'I attribute a positive value to all religions. In their symbolism I recognize those figures which I have met with in the dreams and fantasies of my patients. In their moral teachings I see efforts that are the same as or similar to those made by my patients, when, guided by their own insight or inspiration, they seek the right way of dealing with the forces of the inner life. Ceremonial, ritual, initiation rites and ascetic practices, in all their forms and variations, interest me profoundly as so many techniques for bringing about a proper relation to these forces' (p. 137).

Jung finds that his clinical work leads him to a view of the inner spiritual needs of man's nature which is in harmony with the religious traditions of mankind, and he frequently emphasizes the importance of recognizing those spiritual needs.

If we think in terms of the religious way of life and ignore for a time the question of religious belief, it can be shown that the teachings of religion and of modern psychology correspond very closely at many points. The parallel may be seen clearly in the writings of Dr. Künkel, a German disciple of Adler. He speaks in one place of human life as representing a road 'from the harmony of childhood through the blind alleys of egocentricity and the crises of clarification, to the harmony of the mature individual.' By 'crises of clarification' he means those experiences of life through which childish ego-centricity is gradually broken down. The infant is in harmony with his world because the immediate world of his experience is shaped to meet his needs. The harmony of maturity is reached when the individual learns to give up all ego-centric demands. Freud expresses the same thing in another way when he speaks of passing from the 'pleasure-principle' to the 'reality-principle.' But this 'modern' teaching has an ancient lineage. Christian saints through the centuries have spoken of the 'pilgrimage of the soul from self to God.' And the New Testament constantly reminds us that he that would save his life must lose it. Whether modern psychologists refer to religion or not, they constantly echo some of the central doctrines of the Christian life. The language is different, but the underlying meaning is the same.

But there is at least one important point at which the parallel does not hold. When we touch the question of death and the individual's relation to it, we find a divergence of viewpoint. Christian teaching is based on an assumption about the nature of reality which the psychologist, as a psychologist, cannot share. That assumption naturally colours Christian teaching on death and the attitude to be taken towards it. It is just this teaching which forms the chief target in the Freudian criticism of religion. The doctrine of immortality seems to Freud and his followers an escape mechanism for the neurotic soul afraid to face reality. The criticism is crude, but obviously it cannot be dismissed without careful consideration if we wish to estimate the contribution, negative or positive, which religious belief may make to personal maturity.

It may be helpful to turn again to Professor Jung. The subject obviously interests him. In more than one place he refers

to the need for adjustment to the fact of death. The ordinary goals of life, material security and prosperity, social position, marriage and family interests may be adequate, he sees, for the first half of life, but something more is needed later. His clinical experience has convinced him that a sense of the emptiness and meaninglessness of life can be described as 'the general neurosis of our time,' and he traces this fact to the decay of religion and to absorption in material interests. The second half of life requires for its fulfilment a cultural or spiritual development such as religion formerly provided. He even goes so far as to say that he considers 'the religious teaching of a life hereafter consonant with the standpoint of psychic hygiene.'

It is important to recognize exactly what he means by such statements. He is not committing himself to acceptance of religious beliefs. His meaning is best expressed in the statement that religion is 'psychologically true.' He is quite clear that the symbols of religion are inadequate as an account of cosmic reality. He considers that they may even prove an obstacle to full personal development if their true nature is misunderstood. They are symbols of *psychological* reality. He himself prefers the language of psychology in discussing that reality, but he admits that psychology is merely substituting fresh symbols and leaving the ultimate mystery unsolved.

> 'We only shift the symbols back a little, thus shedding light upon a portion of their realm, but without embracing the error that by so doing we have created anything more than a new symbol for that same enigma which confronted all the ages before us' (*Psychological Types*, p. 314).

The nature and the cosmic status of that psychological reality, in other words, are topics on which psychology sheds no further light.

What bearing does all this have on the place of religion and religious belief in personal development? Two important consequences seem to follow. In the first place a strong case can be made for religious education. Children are obviously not ready to discuss the cosmic significance of religious symbols, but some of the needs to which these symbols minister are already real in early life. It does not follow that the traditional methods and content of religious education are absolved from

criticism. A great deal of hard thinking and some wise experimenting is needed. Probably there should be much less emphasis on actual teaching before adolescence and much more on community influence and participation in worship. But the principle that religion should be given a central place in education seems clearly to be established by the foregoing argument.

The second point is equally important if we wish to promote real maturity of character. The nature of the religious teaching given and the general influences of the child's upbringing must be such that the adolescent boy or girl will not find himself in bondage to religious beliefs which his mind can no longer accept. The general influences are perhaps even more important than the teaching. If the spirit of freedom has been present in the early years of child life and an attitude of courage has been developed, the adolescent will have less inclination to cling to religious beliefs through emotional immaturity. He will be ready to adopt Jung's attitude and regard the doctrines of religion as merely symbols of psychological truth, should intellectual integrity compel him to do so.

It is by no means certain, however, that clear thinking will lead him to adopt Jung's position. On philosophical grounds that position is open to considerable criticism. It may be granted that ultimate reality holds mysteries beyond our comprehension, but it is open to grave doubt whether the symbols of psychology should be regarded as in any way more adequate and satisfying than the symbols of religion when we try to penetrate these mysteries. When the Christian thinker speaks of reality as Personal he uses the term in a metaphorical sense. Finite personality is all he knows. But philosophically it seems a more adequate symbol than those which Jung uses, although the latter may be serviceable for psychological purposes. A further point must be noted. Jung distinguishes between physical reality or the reality of nature, and psychological reality. He regards the symbols of psychology and religion as referring only to the latter, and he seems to think of this psychological reality as purely epiphenomenal. But there again he is on very debatable ground. If he seriously holds that position it is doubtful whether he should expect to find a large body of philosophical opinion

on his side to-day. Most philosophers would accord mental or spiritual reality a more central place in the scheme of things.

Nevertheless Jung's insistence on the danger to personal maturity which may lie in religious symbols has a real value. So has Freud's criticism of religion. They focus attention on a real problem. Is it not inevitable that definite religious beliefs should be an obstacle to the attainment of true maturity of personality? The human craving for security is so powerful that religious beliefs are apt to be strongly charged with emotion even in the most favourable circumstances. Does it not follow that the desire to retain them will prevent clear thinking and honest recognition of the circumstances of human destiny? Will religious beliefs not encourage the persistence of emotional immaturity? Would it not be wiser to accept Jung's position that the basic attitudes and adjustments encouraged by religious teaching and symbolized in religious doctrines are of permanent value, but that the interpretation of them must be altered. They should no longer be regarded as referring to ultimate reality but merely to psychological reality.

This question invites several comments. In the first place it should be said that psychological teaching on the lines of Adler and Jung seems logically to demand an attitude of faith towards ultimate reality. It opposes ego-centric reserve and favours an attitude of courage and self-giving in all relationships of life. Consistency demands the same attitude of faith in the face of death. Is such an attitude possible unless accompanied by the belief that the highest spiritual aspirations of mankind may be trusted, that they do yield a clue to the nature of reality? Does this psychological teaching about human attitudes not require for its completion the faith that the universe is not an alien place? Of course the intellectual content accompanying an attitude of faith in the face of death may vary greatly in different individuals. A simple peasant from a Swiss canton may retain a literal belief in the symbols of the Roman faith, while a professor of psychology is aware only of his utter ignorance of the destiny awaiting him. Yet both may go forward to meet death with the same humble confidence in the divine love and mercy. Personal maturity cannot be judged by the intellectual content, but only

by the emotional attitude, as Jung himself points out. That attitude only deserves the name of faith in so far as purely self-centred motives have been eliminated from it.

It must be recognized, however, that complete emotional maturity is a goal of perfection, not a norm by which religion can be judged. The psychologist and the religious teacher alike regard human development in terms of growth away from ego-centricity and towards objectivity or maturity. On that path to maturity many stumble and fall by the wayside. The psychologist speaks of maladjustment and neurosis. The religious teacher speaks of sin. Both are describing the same human failure, and at the heart of that failure lies ego-centricity. The presence of ego-centric wishes within the religious life cannot therefore be taken as a condemnation of religion. Emotional immaturity will show itself in all departments of human life. There is a false religion which is typical of the neurotic soul. That is to be expected. The point at issue is whether religious belief encourages such immaturity or not. Religion is generally judged by its institutional expression, and so the question may be put in another form. Does adherence to the Christian Church promote or hinder personal development?

There can be no final answer to either question. Much depends on the form in which religious belief is presented and on the particular contact with the Christian Church which the individual may make. But recognition of one fact may make for clearer thinking. Just as emotional immaturity may be expected in the religious life of an individual, so it may be found also in the life of the Church. True and false conceptions of religion are constantly at war within the Church. The present age is one of special tension and crisis because there is such rapid change in human knowledge and the conditions of human life. There is a natural tendency to identify Christian ethics with Victorian morality and to confound Christian belief with mediaeval cosmogony. On the other hand modernist writers have sometimes presented us with an emasculated Christianity which seems to regard man as a creature of reason only and to ignore such facts of human nature and religion as Jung brings to our notice. The way of wisdom seems to lie in emphasizing the importance of

emotional maturity in religion rather than in concerning ourselves overmuch with the truth or falsity of particular beliefs.

It is unfortunately true that the customary *ethos* of institutional Christianity to-day as it is found in the typical Anglican parish or Free Church congregation is apt to be uncongenial to young people — or older people — who are living a full life in the modern world. They may feel a real sense of narrowing mental and spiritual horizons as they seek to share in Christian worship. That is almost inevitable in a time of rapid change. There are elements in the worship and teaching of the Church which were adequate to the faith of an earlier day but restrict the vision of the modern man and encourage sentimental immaturity. In particular a crudely anthropomorphic conception of God and of providence colours a great deal of institutional Christianity. Anthropomorphism is inevitable, but it must be recognized as such.

On the other hand it is significant that those elements in Christian worship and teaching which continue to prove most satisfying to the modern man are just those which touch the deepest levels of human experience and have always occupied a central place in the experience of Christian saints. Religion is deeply rooted in the soul of man, although forms of religion may change. Personal maturity cannot be achieved without adjustment in the realm of religion. Outworn religious beliefs may make that adjustment more difficult and may encourage emotional immaturity, but such immaturity has no place in a truly religious attitude to life.

RICHARD WHATELY
ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN

By the Rev. W. J. Cratchley, M.A., Ph.D., Tutor of Ripon Hall, Oxford.

MANY clergy who call themselves Modernists are strangely unaware that the movement to which they owe allegiance has as large a share of heroes as either of the other two theological traditions within the Anglican Church. If Evangelicals can glory in a Simeon and Anglo-Catholics in a Keble, so too can Modernists in such a man as was Richard Whately, Archbishop of Dublin from 1831 until his death in 1863.

Whately was born at Widford vicarage in Hertfordshire on February 1st, 1787, where his father had been vicar for some twenty years. The latter came of an old Puritan family, being a member of the Thompson family of which Lord Haversham was the head. Richard was a sickly child, and for some time was not expected to live. Before his tenth year, however, he was sent to a private school, near Bristol, which had a large West Indian connection, which fact had the effect of enlarging the boy's mind. His delicate nature prevented his taking part in many boyish games. Consequently, he was thrown much upon the society of books and we are told that before long he performed

> 'veritable feats of mental arithmetic, and essayed theoretic flights in ethics and politics.' [1]

As he grew older his excessive precocity became more subdued and he grew tall, strong and well proportioned, although preferring fishing or a solitary ramble to ordinary diversions. In 1805 he matriculated at Oriel College, Oxford, gaining his B.A. degree with a double second class three years later. In 1810 he was awarded the University English Essay Prize for an essay entitled 'The Arts in which the Ancients were less successful than the Moderns.' The following year saw him elected to a fellowship of his college.

As is well known, Oriel College in the twenties of the last

[1] D.N.B.

century had become the home of a new school of religious liberals who were derisively called by their enemies, 'neologians' or 'noetics.' John Eveleigh, Provost of Oriel 1781—1814, had called this school into being by awarding fellowships to those who showed evidence of intellectual ability rather than mere technical attainment. His successor, Edward Copleston, Provost 1814—1828, continued this policy. So was formed the noetic school 'maintaining around them,' according to a contemporary, W. Tuckwell, 'a continuous dialectical and mental ferment—Oriel Common Room stank of logic, was the complaint of easy-going guests—and provoking by their political and ecclesiastical liberalism the great revolt of the Newmania.'[2] Another contemporary says of them that while not in his view men of great learning, 'they sat in their chairs and talked.'[3] Of some interest is Mark Pattison's reminiscence of them. He points to their chief defect being lack of historical training and continues:

> 'The Noetics knew nothing of the philosophical movement which was taking place on the Continent; they were imbued neither with Kant nor with Rousseau, yet this knot of Oriel men was distinctly the product of the French Revolution. They called everything in question; they appealed to first principles, and disallowed authority as a judge in intellectual matters. There was a wholesome intellectual ferment constantly maintained in the Oriel Common Room.'[4]

More recently, the French writer Jean Guitton has said of the Noetics:

> 'On appelait ainsi un petit cénacle d'intellectuels, libéraux et curieux assez ignorants d'ailleurs des grands mouvements philosophiques, et qui cherchaient à tracer une Via Media entre la rigidité de l'orthodoxie et les tendances manifestées par les révolutions continentales.'[5]

He goes on to style Whately 'le prince des Noëtiques.'

As a don, no don was ever less donnish than was Whately and none was ever more feared and respected. Oxonians soon became accustomed to seeing a man of large stature and girth, oddly dressed, striding round Christ Church meadow in company with a horde of dogs for whose amusement he would toss sticks and stones. All Oxford had either smiled or shuddered

[2] W. Tuckwell: *Pre-Tractarian Oxford,* p. 17.

[3] Quoted by S. L. Ollard, *History of the Oxford Movement,* p. 184.

[4] *Mark Pattison's Memoirs,* p. 78.

[5] Guitton, *La Philosophie de Newman,* p. xxi.

at the oft-told story of his visit to the 'at home' of Mrs. Powell, a newly-married lady. The young bride had furnished her drawing room with spider-legged chairs, a fragile type of chair just then becoming fashionable. Whately seated himself on one of these and wriggled incessantly as he talked. 'An ominous crack was heard,' relates Tuckwell, a leg of the chair had given way; he tossed it on to the sofa without comment, and impounded another chair.'[6] When he became Principal of St. Alban Hall he used to lecture his students while lying on a sofa, with one leg hanging over the back. He was a man of large appetite, and when dining in Hall the helping intended for him was, on the servants' whispered admonition to the Fellow serving the dish, of an outstanding size. These peculiarities were but the privileges of an outstanding personality. Whately regarded High Church and Low Church 'as equal bigotries.' The garrulous Tom Mozley writing years later of the Whately of those early days speaks of his being in 'a lofty eminence of free speculation.'

> 'It would not be possible,' he says, 'to describe now the terror his presence was sure to infuse among all who wished things much as they were in their own lifetime. Instead of being comforted and built up in the good old fashion, they were told they were altogether wrong, and must first retrace all their steps and undo all they had been doing. What was worse, the efficacy of the cure which had become necessary consisted in the hearers thinking it out for themselves.'[7]

This corroborates Newman's statement that Whately's

> 'great satisfaction was to find a layman who had made a creed for himself, and he avowed that he was "prima facie" well inclined to a heretic, for his heresy at least showed that he had exercised his mind upon its subject matter.'[8]

Many amusing stories are told illustrating Whately's originality of mind. When John Henry Newman was elected a Fellow of Oriel in 1822 he was placed in the care of Whately, whose task it was to 'draw out' and discover the capabilities of the shy youth. In 1829 came the break between the two when Newman opposed the re-election of Sir Robert Peel who had appealed to the University, having with Wellington decided that Catholic

[6] *Pre-Tractarian Oxford*, p. 26.

[7] T. Mozley, *Reminiscences of Oriel College and the Oxford Movement* (1882), Vol. I, p. 19.

[8] *Letters and Correspondence of J. H. Newman* (ed. by Anne Mozley), Edition 1890, Vol. I, p. 97.

emancipation which he had previously opposed was inevitable. The election resulted in Peel's defeat, and Whately took a humorous revenge on Newman for his attitude in the matter by inviting him to dinner and seating him among a set of the least intellectual men in Oxford, renowned for their fondness of port, and asking him if he was proud of his friends![9] On another occasion a clergyman asked Whately for his opinion of the way in which he conducted a service. 'If you really wish to know what I think of your reading,' replied Whately, 'I should say that there are only two parts of the service you read, well, and those parts exceptionally.' 'And what are these?' said the clergyman. 'They are, "Here endeth the first lesson," and "Here endeth the second lesson."' 'What do you mean, Whateley,' was the indignant reply. 'I mean,' was the answer, 'that those parts you read in your own natural voice and manner, which are very good: the rest is all artificial and assumed.'[10]

Some years after becoming Fellow of Oriel Whately achieved a considerable measure of celebrity by his publication of *Historic Doubts relative to Napoleon Bonaparte*. It was a travesty of Hume's historical method showing, as it did, the ease with which using such a method any historical event could be questioned.

In 1821 Whately married and consequently, according to the rule then in force by which all fellows were obliged to live in college, had to resign his fellowship. A few months previously, however, he had published his book, *The Right Method of interpreting Scripture in what relates to the Nature of the Deity and His Dealing with Mankind*. The book now makes tedious reading, but at the time it was a much-needed tilt at Calvinism, showing as it does how Calvinistic theories conflict with life as we know it. On leaving Oriel Whately became rector of Halesworth in Suffolk, and we are told that he performed

> 'the duties of a parish priest with a conscientiousness then unusual, but they were not so onerous as to leave him without abundant leisure.'[11]

He had sufficient leisure, at any rate, to prepare the Bampton Lectures for 1822, entitled 'The Use and Abuse of Party Feeling in Matters of Religion.' The lectures form an attempt to

[9] J. H. Newman, *Apologia*, p. 39.
[10] *Life of Archbishop Whately*, by E. Jane Whately (1866), Vol. I, p. 55.
[11] D.N.B.

define a *via media* between indifference and intolerance. No harm, he was convinced, can come from honest enquiry. He points, in these Bampton Lectures, to the value of a reverent agnosticism and demonstrates clearly how so often theological terms and shibboleths are bandied about with little real knowledge of their real meaning or import.

Whately's tenure of a country living was of but short duration. In 1825 he was offered and accepted the principalship of St. Alban Hall, now absorbed in Merton. The members of the hall were of so lowly an intellectual calibre that it was known as the Botany Bay of the University, and Whately set about to effect a transformation. He appointed as his vice-principal John Henry Newman, who had not then emerged from his liberal phase in religion. Although the latter only remained at St. Alban Hall for less than a year, for in the year following he was appointed a tutor at Oriel, he was able to give useful assistance to Whately in the preparation of a treatise on logic which the latter suitably acknowledged in the preface on its publication in 1826. Newman was delighted with the book and wrote :

> 'Much as I owe to Oriel in the way of mental improvement, to none, as I think, do I owe so much as to you. I know who it was that first gave me heart to look about me after my election [*i.e.* to a Fellowship at Oriel] and (strange office for an instructor) taught me to think correctly, and to rely upon myself.' [12]

At one time he even thought of dedicating his first book to Whately 'to the effect that he had not only taught me to think, but to think for myself.'[13]

The year 1826 saw not only the publication of a book on logic but also that of an anonymous work, *Letters on the Church by an Episcopalian.* The authorship of the book was at once ascribed to Whately, and the style is unquestionably 'Whatelyan.' At the beginning of the last century an impetus had been given to Anti-Erastian views by the failure of Paley and Richard Watson, Bishop of Llandaff (1782—1816), to secure the revision of the Liturgy and the abolition of subscription to the Articles by undergraduates. Whately says in his *Letters on the Church* that :

[12] *Letters and Correspondence of J. H. Newman,* Vol. I, p. 94.

[13] *Apologia,* p. 37.

> 'It was in truth Satan who first proposed an alliance between the Christian Church and the State, by offering temporal advantages in exchange for some of the things that be God's.' [14]

The State appointment of bishops is vehemently attacked and he goes on to declare that

> 'I disapprove of many of those other parts of the system, which tend not only to make the clergy the mere tools of the civil governor but to degrade them.' [15]

The book concludes with the words :

> 'As citizens, therefore, we ask of the government only that protection which it is bound to extend to all classes; as a Church, we ask nothing of it, but to let us alone.'

To the end of his life he continued to be in favour of disestablishment but without disendowment. In his *Letters on the Church* he anticipates the Tractarians by bringing forth with approval the doctrine of Apostolical Succession in so far as it means a delegation of authority. It was from this book, indeed, that Newman claims to have learned 'belief in the Catholic Church.' Whately, himself, certainly disapproved of the later Tractarian view of Apostolical Succession, and in No. 15 of his *Cautions for the Times* asserts that Church government need not necessarily be episcopal.

In 1829 Whately was appointed to the Drummond chair of political economy, which chair he resigned in 1831 on his appointment by Earl Grey to the Archbishopric of Dublin. The appointment was criticized in many quarters, as his liberal opinions were well known. The newly consecrated Bishop of Exeter (Henry Phillpotts) said in the House of Lords that :

> 'I never knew a man of greater powers, or of a more richly cultivated mind. I never knew a man more strenuous in the pursuit of truth — more fearless in wherever that pursuit might lead him. But having said this, it will not be imagined that I speak invidiously when I say that this very ardent love or truth, in one who happens to have erred in the pursuit of it, only makes him more unsafe as a guide, much more as the absolute arbiter of the opinions of others.' [16]

Protests, however, failed and Whately was consecrated in St. Patrick's Cathedral on the 23rd October, 1931, and was enthroned the same day at Christ Church.

As an Archbishop he seems to have been successful, although treated with jealousy and suspicion in certain quarters. Although

[14] *Letters on the Church by an Episcopalian* (1819), p. 89.
[15] *Ibid.*, p. 123.
[16] *Life of Archbishop Whately*, Vol. I, p. 124.

he had no panacea for Ireland's woes, he thought that disaffection would be reduced if the viceroyalty were abolished and the visits of the sovereign more frequent and prolonged. He was quick to see the real state of the Anglican Church in Ireland. At that time 'twenty-two Protestant bishops,' as Trevelyan puts it, 'drew £150,000 a year, and the rest of the Church £600,000 more, very largely from the Catholic peasants.'[17] In 1833 Earl Grey introduced the 'Irish Church Temporalities Bill,' by which Irish Church rates were withdrawn from the Church and the suppression of a number of sees became a financial necessity. The Archbishop of Dublin was honest and courageous enough to vote for the bill, an act which brought upon him the wrath of the Tractarians and of Newman in particular. From his home in Dublin he continued to watch affairs at Oxford with considerable interest. It was on his recommendation that R. D. Hampden was appointed in 1836 to the Regius Professorship of Divinity. The publication of W. G. Ward's *Ideal of a Christian Church* led to his writing to the Vice-Chancellor on October the 26th, 1844, urging him to vindicate the Protestantism of the University, although he always regretted Ward's subsequent degradation, maintaining that he should have been merely expelled from the University. The Archbishop regretted the failure of the proposal to censure Tract 90. 'Tract 90,' he wrote to H. Moore (later Archdeacon of Stafford),

> 'was elicited from Newman by the solicitations of a great body of his followers, who insisted on having, if they were not to join the Romish Church, some scheme of interpretation laid before them by which they could professedly adhere to the Articles. And they accordingly obtained one which would have taught them, if need were, to subscribe to the Koran.'[18]

Whateley did not merely confine his activities to the mere discharge of his episcopal duties and to the writing of books. In a letter to Earl Grey he urged the reform of the penal system of the day, maintaining the abolition of all punishments except such as were strictly and merely deterrent. He disliked oaths sworn on secular occasions, and in 1837 petitioned Queen Victoria for relief from the duty which fell to him of swearing in the Knights of St. Patrick. On the whole, he was opposed, too, to

[17] Trevelyan, *History of England*, p. 481.

[18] *Life of Archbishop Whately*, Vol. I, p. 186.

any form of declaration or asseveration on entering Parliament. He urged gradual emancipation for the slaves rather than a sudden act of emancipation which might involve them in poverty. A rigid sabbatarianism, he deplored, and he approved of the legislation for the legalization of marriage with a deceased wife's sister. In 1852 and 1857 he took a prominent part in the meetings of the British Association in Ireland.

With the Irish Roman Catholics, Whately for some years was able to work with a measure of harmony. In 1837 he had written *Easy Lessons on the Christian Evidences*, a book which was widely used in mixed schools until the coming of the ultramontanist, Archbishop Cullen, caused its use to be condemned. In 1851 the Rev. George Spencer (Father Ignatius), a Roman Catholic priest, was received in audience by Archbishop Whately in order that he might explain his proposed scheme of organizing universal prayer for the re-union of Christendom. Whately had several other clergy with him, and after he had exchanged greetings with Mr. Spencer, said to him, 'These gentlemen are all, my chaplains, tho' they are not, all my chaplains.' 'I see,' returned the other, taking his seat, 'that you have not forgotten your logic!'[19] A conversation ensued in which the Archbishop pointed out that Christians already prayed for unity every time they recited the words 'Thy kingdom come' in the Lord's Prayer. It quite soon became manifest, however, that the Archbishop and Mr. Spencer differed in what they believed was the best method of arriving at religious unity. The Roman Catholic priest appeared to think that it should be sought directly, while the Archbishop thought that it should be sought through a common arrival at religious truth. The latter insisted upon the importance of

> 'cultivating a love of truth for its own sake, and of forming such a habit of mind as shall lead its professor to embrace any opinion, however contrary to his prejudices, which he may be honestly convinced is true, and to reject any, no matter how congenial to his tastes and sentiments, or how strongly supported by authority, if it were proved to him to be false. And the Archbishop professed himself always ready to act by this rule. Mr. Spencer seemed startled. He enquired whether his Grace held all his opinions thus loosely; whether, for instance, he regarded as a doubtful and unsettled point the inspiration of the sacred Scriptures. The Archbishop replied that Mr. Spencer appeared to have misunderstood him. He did not mean to say that his opinions on

[19] *Life of Archbishop Whately*, Vol. II, p. 203.

such points as he had examined and made up his mind on were varied or undecided. He meant that having embraced the opinions which he held because he believed them to be true, he was ready to renounce them if they were shown to be false. While he held them he was of course convinced of their truth.'

It was in the same year that he had interviewed Mr. Spencer that the Archbishop founded the 'Society for Protecting the Rights of Conscience,' a society which had as its primary aim the protecting from persecution of converts from Roman Catholicism. No man was ever more a liberal in religion and certainly no man more anticipated many modern ideas. His breadth of outlook was shown by his treatment of Joseph Blanco White. The latter was a Spaniard who had been ordained to the Roman Catholic priesthood at Seville in 1800. Shortly afterwards he came to the conclusion that Christianity was an imposture. In the confusion that followed Napoleon's occupation of Madrid he fled to England. After the course of some years his belief in Christianity having somewhat returned he was received into the English Church, and the year 1826 saw him at Oxford where he had received an M.A. degree by diploma and had become an honorary member of the Oriel Common Room, where he frequently met Whately who rapidly became his hero. When the latter went to Ireland he took Blanco White with him as tutor to his son. But a few years passed when the ex-Roman decided that there was no half-way house between Catholicism and Unitarianism; he must embrace the latter creed. Although he left the Archbishop's household and finally died at Liverpool in 1841, a lonely, miserable old man, to the last he enjoyed a pension from Archbishop Whately, who frequently corresponded with him. In ethics the Archbishop was an intuitionist of the school of Butler, and in his teaching he dwelt more upon the life of Jesus Christ than upon His death, the necessity of which he denied. His belief in the supremacy of the mind was unshakeable. 'When Mrs. Whately and I married,' he said to a friend on one occasion, 'one of the first things we agreed upon was, that should Providence send us children, we would never teach them anything that they did not understand.' 'Not even their prayers, my Lord,' enquired his friend. 'No, not even their prayers,' was the answer. He went on to explain that he held that for children to say prayers they did not understand was to

encourage the idea that a person is praying when merely repeating a form of words.[20] In his *Essays on some of the Dangers to the Christian Faith* (1839) he maintains that :

> ' If the balance of intellectual appeal be not preserved, the almost certain result will be, either an utter indifference to religion, or else that slow corroding scepticism.' [21]

The Archbishop anticipated the cry of the next decade of ' Back to Christ.' In the book just quoted his plea is such, and he maintains that to refer ordinary people to the Fathers, the Councils and so forth

> ' is to tell a plain, unscientific man, ignorant of astronomy and destitute of telescopes, that he must regulate his hours, not by the town clock, but by the satellites of Jupiter, from observations and calculations of their eclipses.' [22]

In spite of his great intellectual powers Richard Whately was no mere barren intellectualist. ' I was surprised and gratified,' he wrote to his friend Edward Copleston, Bishop of Llandaff,

> ' to hear so favourable an account of your diocese, labouring as it does under the disadvantage of the Welsh language. The difference, however, is perhaps greater in appearance than in reality ; at least, I am certain that in a vast many instances the clergy address their facts in a language quite as unintelligible to the lower orders as English to a Welshman. And if they do not go about to the cottages, and instead of talking to the people get them to talk and state their own impressions, the failure remains undetected.' [23]

In the same way he held that the bishops should ' go about their dioceses,' and indeed was of the opinion that the bishops should not hold seats in the House of Lords, maintaining that their duties were such as to allow insufficient time for statecraft.

Whately died in 1863 after a long, painful illness. Within quite recent years there were many living in Dublin who could recall the tall figure of ' the great Whately ' as he wended his way to St. Patrick's. He has his memorial still in the chair of political economy which he founded at Trinity College, Dublin, and in the words of Newman in the *Apologia*, ' I have never ceased to love him.'

[20] *Life of Archbishop Whately,* Vol. II, p. 217.

[21] *Dangers to the Christian Faith* (1839), p. 85.

[22] *Op. cit.,* p. 180.

[23] *Life of Archbishop Whately,* Vol. I, p. 72.

RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION IN THE TRAINING COLLEGE

By Kate Naylor, B.A., ex-Principal of Grahamstown Training College, South Africa.

THE article of 'Housemistress' in a recent issue prompts me to touch on my own experience of thirty years, mainly in a large Training College. I do so because much of what is said of Religious Instruction in the Secondary School applies also to the Training College, while the question of teachers and view-point concerns all schools. I believe that a series of articles from teachers, known or unknown, whose handling of this subject is linked with their own personal striving, would encourage our younger men and women on whom the Church in this age must depend.

I would go at once to the root of the matter: what is the aim of life—the good I want for my pupils and myself? I would boldly say (*a*) to explore the universe and (*b*) to attain to Sonship in the Kingdom of God. It is independent of station; it reaches from the cradle to beyond the grave; it transcends, as it disciplines and ennobles, all partial and vocational aims. I found it on the hills of South Africa and, if what follows comes out of a life-work in that land, we know there is no remoteness in spiritual things.

Like so many young teachers, I went out with college honours and a heart for service, but vague as to my religious beliefs and unequipped to instruct others; I had to find myself in wrestling to find God. It was an Anglican Institution, under government. The students were European, of different races and denominations; most of them were between seventeen and twenty years of age; they came from far and wide and were lodged in hostels each with a house-mistress at its head. As assistant and as principal I had contact in my time with several thousands of these girls.

Religious Instruction was a notable feature of the college. For this purpose the students were divided into Anglicans and Nonconformists. On 'Scripture mornings' the Anglicans were

grouped according to their classes and received Church teaching from the Warden once a week and instruction from one of the staff on the other days, while the Nonconformists gathered from different classes for instruction as a body by ministers of their Churches, who each gave a weekly lesson. In the leaving classes Anglicans and Nonconformists together had a series of lessons from one of the staff on the method of teaching the government Scripture syllabus in the Primary School. In addition, there was a weekly Bible-class for Anglicans and one for Nonconformists taken by each house-mistress in her hostel.

It is not my purpose to describe in detail the practical working of this system; I set it down to show that it might make peculiar demands on the staff who shared the teaching. It sometimes happened that one turned from Anglicans to Nonconformists or to a combined class in college and again to the Anglicans and Nonconformists of a particular house. Will it seem strange to some when I say that in learning to understand and value and surmount denomination I came to realize the underlying unity that embraces all?

The work involved was as hard as any I did in my college days, but it was more than an intellectual effort; it was linked with the struggle to satisfy my own soul's need. The students helped me: I saw myself in them. Many were in the 'puckered stage,' when youth wants to be sure there *is* a Gospel and, if so, to know it according to their day. I read their disinclination to accept a view merely because the Church taught it. If they had come to trust you in other things, they would trust your sincerity in this; or they would take to a thing because it appealed to them in itself as real or acceptable. They had a reverence for the Bible, even when they knew little of it, and they had a feeling, often profound, for natural environment. The Bible and the land were closely linked — both spoke to them of God.

I was but a little further on; I had asked some questions. In those days Dr. Gore was Bishop of Birmingham; the *Lux Mundi* group were in high esteem and I read what I could get of these, especially Gore and Illingworth. I knew a little of Bible criticism and thought these writers, like other careful teachers, gave the rein so far, only to hold it tighter at that point. Dr. Peake's early books and one or two of Dr. Inge's prompted to freer

thought. The country with its splendid features beckoned. Out in the spaces there was breath of spiritual integrity; the broad lines of wisdom — the same that men had pondered on through the ages — were here displayed. I found a method which even in the busiest years I would not quite forgo: it was to take a portion of a holiday — some two or three weeks — each year, preferably in a Karoo-mountain district, as an out-door Retreat for 'hearing and asking questions.' During term there was no adequate time; one could but search and think in bits, saving over the troubled areas. There were teachings that science had unsettled and others that we and our age could not impart with a candid eye — they touched the quick of personal sincerity.

How did this out-door Retreat method help me with the students? It made me a seeker alongside them. I was not able to give them a ready-made system; in many things we had to explore together. It also made me view things in their setting — in the whole, look for spiritual meanings, appreciate essentials and feel shy of intellectual 'finalities.'

Here I would touch on a matter that concerns students, both men and women of the undergraduate stage. Some authorities maintain there is a difference in the psychology of the sexes, as such. I would suggest rather that there are two ways of experience: commonly, but by no means always, women experience environmentally, men intellectually. Education and their different rôle in life have much to do with this. Because of the way the world is carried on, more importance seems to attach to intellectual aspects. The other way is, however, fundamental; it is linked with the mystical — with our membership in the whole. The danger arises from taboos and from vagueness or irrelevancy where there should be precision; for all experience has intellectual aspects, even that which is called in the language of mysticism 'given'; it leaves us, in the long-run, intellectually engaged. On the other hand, I used to warn the students that unrelieved specialisation can easily impair the soul's health by starving it of fellowship in the whole. You can isolate studies and pursue them with charts and numbers, you can spy out aspects of a Promised Land. The methods work, the figures seem to 'go out'; but this process demanded the exclusion of much, and the danger was lest when the conclusion was reached

this exclusion should be forgotten. What was excluded was the vast 'remainder,' to which all aspects must be restored to be solved in the whole. The ultimate whole is God; in Him alone all things finally 'go out'—all ways. Hence, in subordination we taste the fullness of life.

Towards the close of my teaching days I cared more for direction than denomination, trying to prompt discussion and meet needs as they arose rather than work a scheme.

BOOK REVIEWS

ARTHUR BURROUGHS*

An episcopal biography, unless the Bishop happens to have been a missionary or a martyr or a statesman or a great scholar, is not likely to possess much interest.

Arthur Burroughs, Bishop of Ripon (1926—1934), meant much to his friends but very little to the general public save for a brief period during the Great War when his contributions to *The Times* aroused widespread interest. Educated at Harrow and Balliol he distinguished himself as a classical scholar but in this sphere he was brilliantly imitative, not profound or original. He was deeply devotional and strongly moral from his earliest years, and his supreme interest in life was religion—not speculative religion, but religion, personal and applied. He became a Liberal-Evangelical and his mission in life was, to use an old-fashioned phrase, the 'saving of souls,' particularly the souls of English Public School boys. By them he was appreciated and understood. His comparatively brief life of active service fell into three periods—Oxford Don (Fellow of Hertford College), Cathedral Dignitary (Canon of Peterborough, Dean of Bristol), and Bishop of Ripon. Extreme conscientiousness marked his work in each of these spheres. Indeed, he may be said to have died early from overwork.

As an English Churchman, the Bishop's lot was not a happy one. His Liberal-Evangelicalism deprived him of the support of many old-fashioned Evangelicals. One of the causes of the ecclesiastical downfall of Evangelicalism is its failure to recognize its true friends—the Liberals. Mr. H. G. Mulliner writes of the attitude of the Evangelicals towards Arthur Burroughs:

> 'They were never sure that he was "sound" in doctrine and his tendency to the "re-statement" of ancient truths worried them: they did not always recognise their old friends, the fundamentals, in their new clothing. Possibly Burroughs felt that they never knew their old friends quite well enough to recognise them when they saw them' (p. 96).

The Bishop was not beloved by the Anglo-Catholics owing to his inability to forget and value the Reformation. This led him to oppose the introduction of mediaeval doctrines and ceremonies into the Church Services. He

* *Arthur Burroughs.* A Memoir by H. G. Mulliner, with an introduction by the Archbishop of York. (Nisbet. 1936. 5/-.)

also resented the assumption of the Anglo-Catholics that they were more representative of the Church of England than were the Evangelicals.

The Bishop was not a wholehearted Modernist, partly because he was too much of an individualist and too little of a theologian and Biblical critic. He failed to support Dr. Barnes, the Bishop of Birmingham, in his courageous conflict with sacramental materialism and declined to vote in the Northern Convocation with Dr. David, the Bishop of Liverpool, in his stand for comprehensive churchmanship. It is true that in the 'Unitarian controversy' he spoke in Convocation in favour of comprehensiveness, but he voted against his own speech. Of this incident Mr. Mulliner writes:

> 'At the regrettable Liverpool-Unitarian controversy in York Convocation, when he was already "sick unto death," he achieved the unhappy distinction of speaking one way with his conscience and voting the other way with his loyalty' (p. 170).

His attitude towards the Church Assembly was almost contemptuous. Mr. Mulliner writes:

> 'He shamelessly used the meetings of the Church Assembly for writing letters: the administrative questions, which largely occupy that body, had little attraction for him . . .' (p. 169).

The Bishop was really not interested in Church machinery nor in the minutiae of Diocesan organization. Mr. Mulliner remarks sardonically, out of the fullness of his experience as the Bishop's domestic chaplain:

> 'He was new to the pettiness which creeps into parochial affairs and of that element of intrigue with which diocesan officials are tempted to promote the Kingdom of God and even lesser objectives' (p. 106).

Burroughs was essentially a Christian prophet and a spiritual counsellor. He was able to transact business competently and did it, not as his main concern but as a waster of precious energy and time. We are not sure that he was not right in this estimate. Many of our bishops to-day seem to be devoting too much of their time and energy to the details of official routine and too little to their prophetic and evangelistic duties. Cannot some means be found by the delegation of many of their official duties to suffragan bishops, archdeacons, rural deans, domestic chaplains, secretaries, registrars and chancellors to liberate our bishops for those greater duties of moral and spiritual leadership based upon profound reflection and comprehensive learning which is so urgently needful in an emotional age and a half-educated democracy. We need as never before a Westcott, a Lightfoot, a Thirlwall, a Creighton, a Stubbs upon the episcopal bench to-day. Mr. Mulliner is to be congratulated for the life-like portrait he has produced and for his fidelity both to truth and friendship.

H.D.A.M.

THE MEDIEVAL PULPIT *

This is Dr. Owst's second contribution to the study of the English medieval sermon. Yet before the appearance of his previous book, *Preaching in Medieval England,* no serious attempt had been made to survey this extensive and important branch of the Church's activity. At a time when the vast majority of the population was unlettered, when amusements as we know them to-day were practically non-existent, and when the Church was the only source and patron of culture, the pulpit must have exerted an immense influence on the thoughts and feelings of English men and women.

* *Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England.* By G. R. Owst, M.A., D.Litt., Ph.D. Cambridge University Press. 1933. 30/-.)

Whatever may have been the prevailing philosophy in the Universities, it was the sermons preached by clergy, high and low, in the pulpits of the towns and villages of England which shaped the religious and moral ideas of the people. Academic disputation, scholastic philosophy, the administration of diocese and church property, discipline and Canon Law do not exhaust the activities of the Medieval Church. When services were in Latin, the point of contact between cleric and layman was the vernacular sermon. If we would know what the Church of the Middle Ages was saying and what the common man was thinking, this literature must be of first importance. It seems, therefore, almost incredible that such a rich and promising field should have been virtually neglected by generations of historians, secular, ecclesiastical and literary. In spite of most of the sermon literature being still in unpublished MSS., it is unlikely that it would have lain unexplored in most other European countries — certainly not in Germany. Our debt to Dr. Owst, then, in undertaking such a survey is considerable.

> 'It reveals,' says Dr. Owst, 'a Church striving by word of mouth, however fitfully, to curb wild passions and vicious habits, to educate the masses to a higher way of life, to re-unite a discordant society in brotherly love and in common service, to establish, according to its lights, a city of God upon earth, in every home and community warning, pleading, arguing, now with a show of learning, now with a quaint symbolism, now with threats, now with pathos, now with humour, a very human as well as a very formidable Church' (Preface, p. xiv).

But it is with the sermon's contribution to literature, and still more with its influence upon literary history, that Dr. Owst is mainly concerned. And he has followed the excellent plan of allowing the sermons to speak for themselves by including in the text a very large number of extracts in the preachers' own words, especially from those sources which are least accessible.

Even in the sphere of language the sermons played an important part, for, at a time when Latin and French were the languages of academic, official and court use, they 'maintained a regular public use of the English tongue by educated men from the days of the Conquest.' The Friars, often at first trained abroad, brought Gallic elements into the popular speech, as well as Continental culture and ideas. And in their efforts to attract the ear of the people, the preachers, while openly condemning the *trouvère* and *jougleur,* were not averse to using their methods. To this end they deliberately fostered, for example, the cult of the Virgin to counteract the secular love-themes. But of far greater importance for its influence on later literature is the stark realism of the sermons. It is here that we see mediæval life in all its brightness and squalor, as the preachers draw on the scenes and affairs they saw around them. Nothing is too homely or too exalted, no one too mean or too noble, to escape the keen eye of friar, secular cleric, or bishop in the pulpit.

> 'On its purely doctrinal side the English pulpit of the waning Middle Ages had little inspiration to offer . . . Fortunately, however, the preacher, unlike the schoolmen, had direct and continuous contact with Life. In the sermon as organ of a virile, picturesque speech and a keen critical view of society, as medium for lively anecdote, homely portraiture, witty and ruthless satire, we have to deal with something of an entirely different order' (pp. 54-5).

The sermons make extensive use of Scripture allegorically interpreted, often carrying the allegorization to absurd lengths. Thus 'Jacob's ladder

is picked out of its context and discussed allegorically according to its two sides and seven rungs, its length and height.' Especially popular was the *figure* of the *Ship,* which represents sometimes the Faith, sometimes 'Holy Church' manned by the Prelates, sometimes mankind, or even the realm of England. It is the *Ship* as representing England that the *figure* passes into the hands of the secular political poet. Similarly, the allegorical *Castle* of the sermons turns up in Piers Plowman, and centuries later in Bunyan. And it was the medieval pulpit which personified the vices and virtues and fashioned them into the well-known types and characters which appear and re-appear in literature right down to post-Reformation times, where they live once again in the *Pilgrim's Progress.*

> '. . . in view of the profound gulf which is supposed to divide the religion of Protestantism from the pre-Reformation era, no one seems to have realized that the style and even the matter of pulpit exposition had changed but little even in Bunyan's own day. . . . It is only a complete ignorance of medieval preaching in England that has hitherto prevented editors and critics of his [Latimer's] sermons from realizing that they follow directly the style of homely vernacular discoursing in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. His racy anecdotes, snatches of reminiscence, his simple directness of speech, his use of popular proverbs, his outspoken denunciation of corrupt judges, "unpreaching prelates" . . . are all too precisely given in the medieval style to allow of any doubt as to where the manner of speech was learnt' (pp. 98-9).

Dr. Owst finds striking parallels between Bunyan and the figures and types which appear in the medieval sermons. 'No one,' he concludes, 'mirrors more clearly than he the mind and methods of our English sermon-allegorists of the later Middle Ages, and the influence of their message upon subsequent generations of Englishmen' (p. 109).

The medieval homilist combined, with a naïve interest in Scriptural and mythical personages, a love of bringing them up to date by clothing them in medieval dress. Thus Moses becomes a 'grette and curious philosofre,' the Magi are university 'masters,' God Himself is pictured as a 'chefe-justice, sytting in his mageste.' This curiosity for personal detail led the preachers to embroider Scripture and the lives of the Saints with all kinds of wierd and wonderful details, of which Dr. Owst gives many examples. Fiction, in fact, played a large part in helping to convey the preacher's moral, and he ransacked mythology, natural history, chronicles, reminiscences of foreign travel and contemporary life for his *exempla,* often enlivening them with touches of local colour. Always in the forefront is a 'childish affection for the marvellous,' such as miracles wrought by relics or the Sacred Host. From the pulpit these stories passed into literature, re-appearing in the *Gesta Romanorum* or the *Canterbury Tales,* and were still alive in the Elizabethan Renaissance.

By far the most considerable and detailed part of Dr. Owst's book is taken up with *The Preaching of Satire and Complaint.* It is impossible in the space of this review to do more than touch on a few of the main points, but it is here that the author finds the 'profoundest and most abiding influence of the English Pulpit.' That influence is seen in the political songs which voiced the sufferings of the common people, whose pessimism, bitterness and even language are, as Dr. Owst shows, none other than those of the contemporary pulpit; it is seen in Langland, Chaucer, Gower, the Scottish Chaucerians, Skelton, the Elizabethan drama, and the Reformation satirists. The spirit of the medieval preacher is reflected in all of them. For in the sermons of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries no class

escaped the lash of the clerical moralist's whip. The vices of Churchmen, whether prelates or friars, monks or seculars, were denounced from the pulpit not only by the Lollards, but by their orthodox opponents, in what Dr. Owst calls 'one long-drawn cry of anguish and bitter complaint.'

> 'But when all the vesture of possible exaggeration has been stripped off these sermons . . . the historian . . . will understand, as never before, the depth of feeling which lies behind the denunciatory and satiric verse of the later Middle Ages in England. At all events, he can no longer mistake it merely for the ravings of a few disgruntled heretics' (pp. 284-5).

All classes of society equally come in for their share of the pulpit attacks, but especially the rich and powerful are sought out—lords, knights, lawyers, ecclesiastics. Nor were these denunciations made only by the poorer and obscurer clergy; those of Bromyard, the anti-Lollard Chancellor of Cambridge, are as severe as any. Dr. Owst brings passage after passage to show how largely 'the preaching not merely of friars but of other orthodox churchmen of the day was ultimately responsible for the outbreak of the Peasants' Revolt.'

For the satire and complaint of the pulpit against every other stratum of English life—lawyers, physicians, merchants, labourers—and against the multitudinous domestic and personal vices, recourse must be had to Dr. Owst's book itself. Suffice it to say that the preacher's influence went over into literature and was not lost. It fostered a ruthless realism, a sense of comedy as well as of tragedy, and led to 'the first steps on the road of political and religious liberty.' In this sense it prepared the way both for a Shakespeare and a Cromwell.

The last two chapters are among the most valuable and important in the whole book. Here the author deals with the influence of the pulpit on the drama and on Langland's *Vision*. Dr. Owst is able to show that the evolutionary theory, which derived the popular drama from the liturgy, is unsatisfactory and insufficient. It was popular preaching which was responsible for the secularization of the drama—the friars showed the way to the market-place by setting up their *scaffoldi* and preaching there. The comic interludes grew up out of the preachers' satiric anecdotes. The favourite characters and stories, animals and devils, the personified virtues and vices of the drama, are those of the pulpit.

> 'In scene after scene of the plays we have found it possible to trace each dominant idea in the preacher's mind, his view of the world as well as of religion, his little mannerisms and tricks of speech, his own tears and laughter. . . . Thus the expanded vernacular play itself often seems to be little more than a dramatized sermon or set of sermons. . . . In other words, the medieval pulpit is the long-forgotten foster-mother of our modern stage' (p. 547).

Finally, in its impartial view of feudal society, its doctrine of work, its sympathy for the poor and oppressed, its championship of justice, 'the Vision of Piers Plowman represents nothing more nor less than the quintessence of English medieval preaching gathered into a single metrical piece of musical charm and vivacity' (p. 549).

Every one of this book's 596 pages is interesting; much of it is of first-class importance. Its value lies not least in the abundant quotations from unprinted sources, and its careful documentation, which make it a veritable storehouse of information for anyone engaged in medieval studies. Even where literary interests are secondary, those who wish to get a clear pic-

ture of the medieval church and of medieval society, as well as of the pulpit, will find this book fascinating. Dr. Owst at times, no doubt, overstates his case. But his work cannot be ignored either by the social or literary historian.

A. W. Adams.

EX UMBRIS ET IMAGINIBUS IN LUCEM*

M. Alfred Loisy is one of the most prolific of writers as he is one of the most learned of scholars. In 1933 his *La Naissance du Christianisme* appeared: three other books followed in swift succession, and now we have a fourth, *Les Origines du Nouveau Testament*. It comprises 375 pages. Besides being prolific and learned M. Loisy has also the reputation of being very sceptical. The unhistorical and mythical elements in the Bible assume for him larger proportions than for most Biblical scholars in this country. We cannot here summarise his conclusions as to the origin of the different books of the New Testament. We cite one example of his critical conclusions. He puts our canonical text of St. Luke's Gospel as late as 140 A.D. Although his textual and historical criticism is so drastic this does not mean that M. Loisy does not value the New Testament as a witness to the character of primitive Christianity and he has much to say of the features and spirit of that religion in its early stages. He is, however, convinced that the magical and mythical elements in that religion were very considerable and that it is very necessary that the true and inexpressibly precious essence of the Christian religion should not be confused with its mythical and magical elements. He concludes his volume with these striking words:

> 'It matters little in the long run, what can be said textually about Jesus, Peter, Paul, or John, and those who afterwards spoke for them; what is important is the fire that they have kindled, and which will doubtless not be extinguished until humanity disappears. For if men pass, humanity remains; and if religions become extinguished, religion ever shines. Men would have been long ago exterminated, victims of their own follies, if the religious ideal had not rescued them at the very instant when they were rushing to their fate. May it be theirs to render this religious ideal ever better and better and so secure for themselves this law of their progress!' (p. 353).

Beginning his scholastic career as a devoted orthodox Roman Catholic, his critical studies unflinchingly pursued led to his expulsion from the Roman Catholic Church and some would have said also to his apostasy from the Christian religion. But to charge him with apostasy from the Christian religion is unjust. He has not deserted the Christian religion: he has learnt to separate between the false and the true, the temporary and the eternal, the magical and the spiritual elements in it, and whilst retaining the true, the eternal and the spiritual he has jettisoned the false, the temporary and the magical. What he has done it is hardly too much to say he is convinced that mankind must also do in the end if civilization is to advance, and not to be overwhelmed in wholesale destruction. M. Loisy is hailed by many of his opponents as the apostle of negative New Testament criticism but to have arrived at such a conclusion as we have indicated is not to have arrived at a negation but at a profound affirmation of inestimable value. Those who hold it are separated by an impassable abyss from the materialists and the immoralists. They see the true human life

* Libraire Emile Nourry, 62 Rue des Écoles, Paris. 1936. Price 30 frs.

as realized only in communion with God and in a fellowship based upon justice and love towards our fellow men. With another quotation exhibiting M. Loisy's essential faith we conclude this all too brief notice of his latest contribution to New Testament criticism. We might wish that he had placed a higher historic value, such as we do ourselves, on the writings of the New Testament, but this is of little importance compared with a true evaluation of their moral and spiritual quality and potentiality.

'This is not the same as saying that we must suppose that religion has no future on our planet. It is not religion, but it is the predominance of the magico-mythical supernatural in religion that seems to have perished for ever. In one sense, the Christian ideal has never been more needful nor more immediately practicable than in the civilising movement of our times. The Christian ideal expresses itself in the ideal of a reign of justice, realized or realizable by the law of love, although the Gospel, by reason of its eschatological form, presents magically, if one may say it, and in a Utopian manner, this fundamental idea of the greatest human ideal which is actually comprehensible by us. It expresses itself in the idea of the inner peace of man, realized by faith in the profound value of the rebirth of the soul, of the spiritual life, under the law of justice and love. . . . It expresses itself in the idea of a universal society of believers, the true Catholic Church, the fatherland of all souls, united by the practice of justice in the law of love and in the optimistic trust, assured to man in the experience of his rebirth by this sublime law. Traditional Catholicism, with its dogmatic orthodoxy, its domineering hierarchy, its blindly imperialistic papacy, is in many respects, a caricature of this ideal Catholicity that we are trying to present.

'Thus this ideal should be regarded as the essence of Christianity, although in historic Christianity, even from the first imperfectly realized. It should also be the very essence of the religion of humanity; undogmatic and increasingly perfectible in the future. But the most childish anachronism would be committed in thinking that this ideal had been thus conceived from the first and expressly formulated in the New Testament; it is there as a seed, under the soil of the magico-mythical supernatural. Nevertheless the seed was living, it was already, in a large measure alive with spiritual life, the true supernatural, that which will henceforth spring up and put forth blossoms in the human soul, and in the social life of mankind, if humanity would live.

'Just as primitive Christianity, in adapting itself to the conditions of the Mediterranean world, imposed itself upon that world because it carried within itself a human ideal much superior to that of the pagan religions and to the speculations of Greek philosophy, so also it will be necessary to-day for those holding the same Christian ideal, released from its traditional fetters, enlarged in accordance with all the needs and all the legitimate aspirations of contemporary civilisation to raise their speculations to the height of all true science, refusing to reject any light, and proclaiming the divine principle of active self-sacrificing love as supreme over every human activity in order to realize a religion which shall be the crown of Christianity and of all religion, having as its ideal the perfecting of the whole human race in the life of the spirit —fellowship with God' (pp. 33-34).

MORE WALKS AND TALKS*

Those who enjoyed Sir Arnold Wilson's 'Walks and Talks' in his pleasant country constituency of Hitchin will gain renewed pleasure from this account of the author's peregrinations in wider lands and amid a greater variety of peoples. The present volume 'chronicles things seen and heard between January 1934 and April 1936, and includes visits to Belgium, France, Germany and Italy.' It is with the last two countries that the main interest lies, and since Sir Arnold's recent utterances in the Press lead the reader to suppose that he has become an enthusiast for, if not a victim of, the totalitarian ideal, he will turn with curiosity and perhaps with some foreboding to the interviews accorded to the author by the two great dictators of Europe to-day.

> 'Herr Hitler left on my mind an indelible impression of single-mindedness, with great reserves of strength. He spoke with vigour and vivacity in German so clear and terse that the services of an interpreter were scarcely needed.'

After such an auspicious beginning the resulting conversations, occupying only a couple of pages of this book, are rather disappointing. The Aryan ideals, the uses of Labour Camps, the brightness of the Nordic future, are matters concerning which the British public has heard enough for a very long time to come.

Of the author's two interviews with Mussolini we are given slightly longer accounts. The man, and not the demagogue, stands out clearly, and even those of us who are unbounded in our dislike and distrust of the Fascist régime, and of that in the long run for which it stands, must agree that from one angle at least the integrity of its promoter is unquestioned.

> 'I mentioned our own record of housing, road-construction, and the like in England. 'At heart I really care less for these material advances than to see a change in the spirit of men,' he (Mussolini) answered. 'If economic changes are to do good, there must be a change of spirit, to give significance and permanent value to any improved standard of living. A nation would not in the long run be happier or better for an extra pair of boots and a little more butter all round. In Italy, as perhaps nowhere else, a spiritual change has occurred.'

Elsewhere Sir Arnold suggests that finance is the biggest problem which confronts both Germany and Italy, but there is no evidence that he believes that the tumult and the shouting of the leaders, and such happenings as the Abyssinian War, are designed primarily to take the minds of their countrymen away from the thoughts of possible bankruptcy. His appraisement of what he sees and hears is not without criticism, but generally speaking his attitude reminds one of the man who said he always waited to see what the opinion of the League of Nations Union would be on a question of public importance, and then immediately adopted the opposite point of view for himself. Abyssinia, the Hoare-Laval Conversations, the Church in Germany are only some of the questions on which many readers will find themselves in disagreement with the author. Because Socialism finds so large a response among Anglo-Catholics, there is no reason to suppose that Totalitarianism is being widely advocated by Modern Churchmen.

* *Walks and Talks Abroad: The Diary of a Member of Parliament in* 1934-36. By Sir Arnold Wilson, K.C.I.E., C.S.I., C.M.G., D.S.O. (London: Oxford University Press. 1936. 6/-.)

The author is at his best away from the great, among the workless, the peasants, the Lutherans who still sing '*Ein' feste Burg*'; there are delightful conversations in cafés, railway compartments, air-liners, yes, and in concentration camps too. To the Englishman who is at home abroad, that is something new, and something essentially worth walking and talking about.

J. R. BATEMAN.

A CLERGYMAN AND HIS WIFE*

There are many clerical biographies: some of the best of them have been written by clergymen's wives. The most outstanding of these are of course the *Life of Charles Kingsley* by Mrs. Kingsley, the *Life of Bishop Creighton* by Mrs. Creighton, the *Life of Canon Barnett* by Dame Henrietta Barnett.

These clerical biographies by the wives of the clergy are a feature of the Church of England. In the Primitive Church and in the Mediaeval Church no such biographies exist and there are good reasons for this. There were few women in the Christian Church of the first three centuries possessed of that literary accomplishment which would have enabled them to write a biography. Later on the kind of clergymen who were married would hardly be the clergy whose biographies would be written, or if written, read, by devout Church people. Indeed it is only in the English Church in the nineteenth century that these lives of clergymen by their wives begin to be published and their appearance indicates not only the rising educational standard achieved by women in England but also the growing influence of the wives of the clergy in the work of the Church. We know that there is a tendency to-day to object to this feminine activity, not we think on the part of the laity, but on the part of the clergy. 'I have no intention,' a young clergyman asserts authoritatively, 'that my wife should be my unpaid curate. If the parishioners desire a curate they must pay the curate's salary themselves.'

Not infrequently the wives of whom this is said are incapable of being their husband's curate and in any case whether a wife becomes her husband's curate should depend on her initiative, not on his. Many clergymen's wives were of the greatest parochial assistance to their husbands long before the nineteenth century: notably Dorothy Charlton, who might almost have been said to have been, not only the curate but also the bishop of that most amazingly efficient and successful parochial clergyman, Richard Baxter of Kidderminster. Mrs. George Herbert in the smaller sphere and briefer tenure of Bemerton did much to assist 'the Country Parson' in his life and work. Other clergymen's wives were as notable for their failure to assist their husbands, if this be not too weak a statement of their *rôle*, notably Mrs. Richard Hooker and Mrs. John Wesley.

It was, however, in the second half of the nineteenth century that the social side of parochial life developed greatly and also popular religious education among women and girls. As a consequence, it fell to the clergyman's wife, where she possessed the necessary gifts and graces, to take a leading part in this department of parochial work.

A clerical biography, charming in its simplicity, unpretentiousness, sympathy and frankness, has been written by Mrs. Hobart-Hampden. Arthur Kennet Hobart-Hampden, grandson of the sixth Earl of Buckinghamshire, educated at Haileybury and New College, Oxford, led for many years the life of a rural clergyman. The most important of his rural

* *Arthur Kennet Hobart-Hampden.* By his wife. (Printed by H. B. Skinner & Co., 124 Denmark Hill, London, S.E.5. 3/-.)

parishes was the family living of Great Kimble, Bucks, which he held for eighteen years. In 1916 he retired to London and in 1922 at St. Peter's Cranley Gardens, deeply moved by the appeal of Archdeacon Fogarty of Damaraland for pastoral help in that Diocese, he offered himself for work there. He was sixty-five years old and had married in 1907 Isabella Thérèse Blagden, daughter of Canon Henry Blagden of Hughenden. Accordingly they both sailed away for South-West Africa on October 5th, 1923.

The greater part of this biography deals with their life and work in this little-known part of the world. It abounds with most vivid impressions and arresting descriptions, particularly of natural beauty. Not less interesting is the account of the different human types to whom this clergyman and his wife ministered and the varied ways in which they did it. Their experiences will seem aptly to illustrate the truth of the Shakespearean aphorism :

> 'Nothing ever comes amiss
> When simpleness and duty tender it.'

Modernism may have its place in the theological lecture room but that it has no place in pastoral work amongst simple people is one of the facile ineptitudes of the ecclesiastical ignoramus. Mr. and Mrs. Hobart-Hampden were devoted members of the Modern Churchmen's Union. Mr. Hobart-Hampden owed not a little of his modernist theology and sympathies to his lifelong friendship with Dr. Hastings Rashdall. The Preface to this most stimulating volume is contributed by another lifelong friend of its subject the Bishop of Edmundsbury and Ipswich. What an admirable picture of an English clergyman is presented by the Bishop's opening words :

> 'Courteous, quiet and unassuming in manner, but with great courage behind, full of admirable conversation, a thinker and one who could listen, with a sense of humour, and possessed of just a slight touch of that quiet originality that sets a man outside the beaten track. . . . His faith was too strong in fundamentals to make his outlook wistful, but it was keen and searching, the "stretching out of the hands to something beyond." The Modernist does this happily, because standing on firm ground. . . .'

H.D.A.M.

THE TRUTH BEHIND THE OLD TESTAMENT *

In his new book Professor Stanley A. Cook has provided students and readers of the Bible with an Introduction of a new kind;* for it differs from the kind of introduction associated with such names as S. R. Driver, Cornill and Sellin by elucidating the methods of approach to the Old Testament, textual, critical, archaeological, historical and religious, instead of discussing the contents, composition and date of the books one by one. Such treatment makes the book easier to read consecutively than the other kind, which is designed largely for purposes of reference. It makes it also better adapted to serve as a stimulus to independent thought and further inquiry.

Two early influences have left their mark upon all the work of the Cambridge Regius Professor of Hebrew : his devoted study of the works of William Robertson Smith, and his researches as a member of the editorial staff of an encyclopaedia of the Bible. The one has rescued him from the bane of deadly dulness ; the other has given him an eagle eye which nothing bearing on his work escapes.

* *The Old Testament : A Reinterpretation.* By Stanley A. Cook, Litt.D. (W. Heffer & Sons, Cambridge, and S.P.C.K., London. 7/6 net.)

His book is packed with information relating to English translations, the Massoretic text, the growth of the Canon, the Septuagint, tradition and criticism, geography, history, folk-lore, religion, archaeology, prophecy, apocrypha and pseudepigrapha, post-exilic readjustments, etc. At the same time it is enriched by the addition of a Chronological Summary, helpful bibliographical and other Notes, a General Index, and two maps.

To suppose, however, that the main purpose of Professor Cook's book is to gather together and illuminate material which is elsewhere very much scattered would be to do it an injustice. Its chief aim is clearly to help us to readjust ourselves to a situation in which a great number of archaeological and other discoveries have disturbed our old notions of the Old Testament. In this sense his book is a re-interpretation. Not a re-interpretation which need shock anybody, for it makes no serious break with the past, and envisages matters with a reverence and religious sympathy which command to the full our respect and admiration.

MAURICE A. CANNEY.

MYSTICISM: MEDIAEVAL AND MODERN*

In his latest book Dr. Rufus Jones suggests that

> 'The two most powerful trends of present-day Christianity are a fresh revival of mystical religion and an awakened passion to carry Christianity into the fabric and tissue of the social life of humanity' (p. 161).

In Chapter X the author deals with the origin of the word mysticism, and gives an account of the various manifestations of mysticism. Besides giving quotations from the Greek mystics of the past he gives quotations from the books of present-day mystics such as Hugh Fausset, Evelyn Underhill, Anker Larsen and an exposition of Mahatma Gandhi's mysticism, which is better expressed as 'soul-force' than 'non-violence' (Chapter IX).

Of the mysticism of the future he writes:

> 'I am eager to have the word mysticism widened out in meaning to include this milder and more normal correspondence of the soul with God. "We come to God," St. Augustine once said, "by love and not by navigation," and, we may add, we come by ascents of faith and hope and love and not alone by flights of ecstasy. Whittier had this in mind when with a touch of real genius he wrote the lines:
>
> *The silence of eternity*
> *Interpreted by love.'*

There are some suggestive thoughts on the mystic's phrases, 'self-emptying,' 'self-noughtings':

> 'Go out, God will go in.
> Die thou, and let Him live.
> Be not, and He will be.
> Wait, and He'll all things give.'

'The most genuine form of inspiration . . . will be . . . that type which brings the divine Spirit and the human self into the truest and closest correspondence and co-operation. Man does not "go out" in order to

* *Of the Imitation of Christ.* In Four Books. By Thomas à Kempis. (Hutchinson and Co. 1935. 15/-.) *The Testimony of the Soul.* By Rufus M. Jones. (The Macmillan Company. New York. 1936. 8/6.)

have God "come in." Rather he humbly presents all that he is, the best that life and experience have done for him, all that has rolled up and accumulated of spiritual gain through the years of joy and sorrow, and lets the light and love of God radiate and break through his whole being both in its conscious and its unconscious levels' (p. 154).

'I incline to the view that what comes from beyond us is in the nature of contact, sense of presence, inflooding of energy, heightening of the quality of life, increase of dynamic, rather than ready-made "communications." And I further believe that the effect is richer when the whole self is unified, with all the powers of the mind co-operatively working with the subconscious life, than when the subconscious life automatically presents its product ready-made to the passive mind' (p. 159).

The author asks: 'How does mystical experience affect one's social tasks?' and quotes Abbé Huvelin: 'If a man should say to me, "To-day I saw God," I should ask him, "How do you feel now that you know God is so near you?"' Dr. Rufus Jones comments:

> 'I should go a step beyond that and ask: How does this experience of yours affect the main business of life? What difference does it make in your impact on the world?' (p. 24).

There is an interesting parallel drawn between two trends of religious thought which have come down to us throughout the ages. These may be called the 'open religion' and the 'safe religion.' The 'open religion' is the religion of the spirit — to live dangerously, to care nought for the goal nor for the road except the Spirit be the guide.

The 'safe religion' is of the institutional type and relies upon ritual and ceremonial — not only to save the soul from death but to keep it in safe paths all the days of our life.

> 'Though love repine and reason chafe
> I heard a voice without reply:
> 'Tis man's perdition to be safe
> When for the truth he *ought* to die.'

Of Karl Barth Dr. Rufus Jones writes:

'Karl Barth, disillusioned by the vagaries of psychology and shaken alike by the pantheistic interpretations of divine immanence, with its cosmic urges, its *libido* and its *élan vital*, has formulated a crisis-theology of retreat and gone back to an excessive doctrine of transcendence which make God's nature and character forever unrevealable in terms of human life or thought or historical movements. God for him is so completely and absolutely other, *Ganz Anders*, that He is beyond all that our minds can think or our agonizing hearts can feel.

> Whatever your mind comes at
> I tell you flat
> God is not *that*.

'This position surrenders the faith that we are fellow-labourers with God and that there is a victory which overcomes the old world and rebuilds the new one according to the divine pattern. It chills forever the hope that "Spirit with spirit may meet." It leaves us in an undivine world and with no eastern windows opening to the Light.'

No student of Mediaeval Mysticism can fail to admire the Imitation of Christ, and Messrs. Hutchinson are to be congratulated on their new edition of it: beautifully illustrated in full colour and with over a hundred black and white drawings by T. H. Robinson. George Eliot's eulogy of

the Imitation of Christ in the Mill on the Floss is probably better known to many English readers than the Imitation itself :

> 'Here, then, was a secret of life that would enable her to renounce all other secrets — here was a sublime height to be reached without the help of outward things — here was insight, and strength, and conquest, to be won by means entirely within her own soul, where a supreme Teacher was waiting to be heard. It flashed through her like the suddenly apprehended solution of a problem, that all the miseries of her young life had come from fixing her heart on her own pleasure, as if that were the central necessity of the universe: and for the first time she saw the possibility of shifting the position from which she looked at the gratification of her own desires — of taking her stand out of herself, and looking at her own life as an insignificant part of a divinely-guided whole . . . She had not perceived . . . the inmost truth of the old monk's outpourings, that renunciation remains sorrow, though a sorrow borne willingly . . . She knew nothing of doctrines and systems — of mysticism or quietism : but this voice out of the far-off middle ages was the direct communication of a human soul's belief and experience, and came . . . as an unquestioned message . . .
>
> 'It is the chronicle of a solitary hidden anguish, struggle, trust and triumph . . . And so it remains to all time a lasting record of human needs and human consolations : the voice of a brother who, ages ago, felt and suffered and renounced . . .'

But there are two valuations of this devotional treasury, and no one has better expressed them both than a nineteenth century Dean of St. Paul's:

'That his book supplies some imperious want in the Christianity of mankind, that it supplied it with a fullness and felicity, which left nothing, at this period of Christianity, to be desired, its boundless popularity is the one unanswerable testimony. No book has been so often reprinted, no book has been so often translated, or into so many languages, as the *Imitation of Christ* . . .'

'The size of the book, the manner, the style, the arrangement, as well as its profound sympathy with all the religious feelings, wants and passions: its vivid and natural expressions, to monastic Christianity what the Hebrew Psalms are to our common religion, and to our common Christianity: its contagious piety : all conspired to its universal dissemination, its universal use. This one little volume contained in its few pages the whole essence of the St. Victors, of Bonaventura without his Franciscan peculiarities, and of the later Mystic school . . . Its manner: its short, quivering sentences, which went at once to the heart, and laid hold of and clung tenaciously to the memory with the compression and completeness of proverbs: its axioms, each of which suggested endless thought: its images, scriptural and simple, were alike original, unique . . . The facility with which it passed into all other languages, those especially of Roman descent, bears witness to its perspicuity, vivacity, and energy. Its arrangement has something of the consecutive progress of an ancient initiation : it has its commencement, its middle, and its close: discriminating yet leading up the student in constant ascent : it is an epopee of the internal history of the human soul.

'The *Imitation of Christ* both advanced and arrested the development of Teutonic Christianity : it was prophetic of its approach, as showing what was demanded of the human soul, and as endeavouring, in its own way to supply that imperative necessity : yet by its deficiency, as a manual of universal religion, of eternal Christianity, it showed as clearly that the

human mind, the human heart, could not rest in the *Imitation*. It acknowledged, it endeavoured to fill up the void of *personal* religion . . .'

'The book absolutely and entirely supersedes and supplies the place of the spiritual teacher, the spiritual guide, the spiritual comforter: it is itself that teacher, guide, comforter . . .'

'But the *Imitation of Christ*, the last effort of Latin Christianity, is still monastic Christianity. It is absolutely and entirely selfish in its aim, as in its acts. Its sole, single, exclusive object is the purification, the elevation of the individual soul, of the man absolutely isolated from his kind, of the man dwelling alone in the solitude, in the hermitage of his own thoughts: with no fears or hopes, no sympathies of our common nature: he has absolutely withdrawn and secluded himself not only from the cares, the sins, the trials, but from the duties, the connexions, the moral and religious fate of the world. Never was misnomer so glaring, if justly considered, as the title of the book, the "Imitation of Christ." That which distinguishes Christ, that which distinguishes Christ's Apostles, that which distinguishes Christ's religion—the Love of Man—is entirely and absolutely left out . . .'

'The *Imitation of Christ* begins in self — terminates in self. The simple exemplary sentence, "He went about doing good," is wanting in the monastic gospel of this pious zealot. Of feeding the hungry, of clothing the naked, of visiting the prisoner, even of preaching, there is profound, total silence. The world is dead to the votary of the *Imitation*, and he is dead to the world, dead in a sense absolutely repudiated by the first vital principles of the Christian faith. Christianity, to be herself again, must not merely shake off indignantly the barbarism, the vices, but even the virtues of the Mediaeval, of Monastic, of Latin Christianity' (*The History of Latin Christianity*, Vol. IX, pp. 161-165).

It is this 'sublime selfishness' of the *Imitation*, transcended, as Dean Milman points out, by Tauler (the most practical of the German mystics) that can be detected even in its most striking and oft-quoted passages:

> 'If you bear the cross cheerfully, it will bear thee, and lead thee to the desired end, namely, where there shall be an end of suffering, though here there shall not be. If thou bear it unwillingly, thou makest for thyself a burden, and increasest thy load, which yet notwithstanding thou must bear.'

M. E. Major.

SEX AND RELIGION*

To many people, a review of such a book, in such a magazine as this, may seem inappropriate, dealing as it does with physical life-processes. It refers, of course, to the sexual changes which occur in the later phase of normal human life. What has sex to do with religion? The connexion is vital not only in the history of religion, but in the history of every individual. In primitive religion the relation was positive, as shown by the practice of sympathetic magic and by religious sexual rites; examples are strewn over the pages of Old Testament history, such practices degenerating into sexual orgies. From the first century of Christianity, by contrast, the relation became negative, so that all sexual manifestations came to be regarded as evil and inimical to true religion. That attitude has prevailed up to the present century, but is now seen by the best religious thinkers to be wrong, and even disastrous. A modern view of religion and a modern view of sex are bound to go hand in hand. That does not make for sexual

* *Change of Life, in Man and Woman.* By Dr. Marie Stopes. (Putnam and Co. 6/- net.)

license, but for a rational outlook on sex problems. And herein Marie Stopes has ventured on an aspect of sex-life which is bound to make appeal to every married man and woman, specially as they approach the last third of their lives. The authoress complains that much of the writings of gynecologists on this phase of woman's life has been misleading, and needlessly depressing in outlook; and that no medical man (with one foreign exception) has dealt reasonably fully with the corresponding climacteric in men, which, in her opinion, often creates a more heart-searching crisis than for the average woman. The distresses of women, she considers, are so greatly overstressed in books as to cause fear-obsessions, and to intensify the symptoms which medical science ought both to relieve, and, by the help of modern discovery, to prevent. Men, on the other hand, do not speak of such disabilities either to friend or doctor, and have to hug their own misfortunes: but these too can be mollified and recovery gained, if knowledge be utilised.

Marie Stopes claims no medical degree; but she has read widely on her subject, and has so large an experience of the sorrows of others, that her views cannot be treated with contempt. And, if her optimism on such troubles is justified, this book will help many a man and woman through the individual and conjugal stresses of advancing years, which now present to them a bleak and arid future. The whole outlook of this authoress is in sympathy with the best religious outlook; modernist and traditionalist, alike, will welcome instruction which ought to make home-life sweeter and more lovely for those who are past their prime. D.W.

A CONFIRMATION MANUAL*

The purpose of this book, according to the Publishers, is 'to provide [for adult] candidates a background to the faith and practice of the Church of England.' It would seem admirably to do this. Its seven brief chapters deal adequately, considering the space available, with the origins of religion and its necessary place in life; with the history and present position of the Church of England. They give all the standard arguments for Bible study, and contain some wise and pithy words on the meaning of its inspiration. Chapters on the Creeds, Sacraments, the Rite of Confirmation and the Communicant Member (of the Church of England) display a broad tolerance which will not be confused with mental sloppiness. The last chapter in particular, with its detailed enumeration of the possibilities of the layman's service to the Church, is most valuable. There is an appendix on sex and marriage, questions which are dealt with on sound commonsense lines.

There is one misleading statement in the book: on page 34, immediately following the statement that the Revised Prayer Book of 1927-8 was rejected by the House of Commons chiefly on account of the revised Communion Service, the author goes on to say that,

> 'although the 1928 book has at present no parliamentary sanction, it is widely used as a permissible variation of the older book by the authorization of most bishops.'

The suggestion that the revised Communion Service is in fact in wide use would seem a dangerous one for the uninstructed. Apart from this, however, the book may be heartily recommended. W. H. OLDAKER.

* *More Talks on Confirmation, for adult candidates and communicants.* By F. Barrie Flint. (Skeffington. 1936. 2/-.)

THE HOPE OF IMMORTALITY*

The Student Christian Movement Press has rendered a good service by publishing in book form at an attractive price the recent broadcast addresses by the Dean of St. Paul's on Immortality.

The book contains eighty-six pages, consisting of the three original addresses and that devoted to answering the listeners' questions. So short a book, which can be read in an hour, might seem to be too slight for its subject, but to read it once determines the thoughtful reader to read it again; for the argument, and the manner in which it is set out, have the merits of possessing great lucidity and of suggesting profitable lines of thought.

In the first chapter the Dean indicates a surprising number of important aspects of his subject, and concludes by showing reasons for the belief that the mind may not be dependent upon the body for its existence. Having thus briefly suggested the credibility of the doctrine of immortality, he proceeds in the second chapter to bring together a number of important arguments, some famous in the history of philosophy, and others which appeal also directly to common sense.

The third chapter crowns the other two by a clear statement of the essence of the Christian doctrine of eternal life as the gift of God to man, himself by nature potentially immortal, the gift being dependent on our being 'in Christ' and so sharing in His eternal life. The ideas of Heaven and Hell are also discussed with refreshing sanity.

The character of the listeners' questions to which the Dean is forced to give all too brief answers reveals the great value of a book of this kind. The Dean would be the last to claim that in it he has said anything startlingly new; he has put forward a well-reasoned statement of belief whose character is well described by the title of the book, and it is safe to say that here many thoughtful Christians will find an account (stated much better than they could have stated it) either of what they already dimly believe, or of what they will be prepared to believe when they have read it. The many who doubt will find food for hopeful thought in every paragraph.

A. R. C. Leaney.

A CHILDREN'S CHURCH†

The Preface states: 'This book is an attempt to reach the standard which the day-schools have set.' It is the ideal book for all Sunday Schools. *Songs of Praise* is so well known that there is no need to say anything about the Hymns. The book is intended to familiarize children with all that is best in the Prayer Book. There is a Lectionary, Introductory Sentences, an Introduction to Morning or Evening Prayer for optional use, Morning Prayer, Evening Prayer, a short Litany, the Ante-Communion Service, Additional Prayers, Prayers and Thanksgiving set to music, the Collects for the Christian Year (eight verses) and fifteen selected Psalms, pointed.

The Services are, of course, adapted for children, though the alterations are such as would be adopted for adult services were the Church alive. Thus the Venite ends at verse 7 and the Te Deum with 'Also the Holy

* *The Hope of Immortality*. W. R. Matthews, Dean of St. Paul's. (S.C.M. 1936. 2/6.)

† *The Children's Church*: An Order of Morning and Evening Prayer, with Songs of Praise for Children (Melody Edition). Editors: Prayers, G. W. Briggs; Hymns, Percy Dearmer, Ralph Vaughan, W. Williams, Martin Shaw. G. W. Briggs. (Humphrey Milford. Oxford University Press. 1936. 1/6.)

Ghost, the comforter.' Were it always to end thus, the Te Deum would be one of the most popular canticles. The Benedicite is printed in a shortened form, but unfortunately Shadrach, Meshach and Abed-nego (Ananias, Azarias and Misael) are duly told to bless the Lord. Might not this clause have been omitted? In the Evening Prayer, as alternatives to the Apostles' Creed, are given a shortened version of the Modern Churchmen's creed — an ideal version for children — followed by *Ephes.* iv, 4-6, and the summary of the Creed in the Catechism — admirable, but the summary in the Birmingham catechism is much better. The Short Litany is just the right length. The Ante-Communion makes a splendid service for children, though for young ones certain necessary modifications are suggested.

The Prayers are short, well expressed and are just of the kind that appeal to children.

No one need have the slightest hesitation about adopting this book in his Sunday School. Indeed, we devoutly hope that something very like it may one day be adopted throughout the length and breadth of the land.

R. R. Lewis.

THE FOOL HATH SAID*

This is a unique book. In the attempt to 'popularise' Christianity many books have been written, and the result has been, for the most part, distasteful, but Mr. Nichols's book, for all its colloquialism, for all it contains that may displease the theologian, is so burningly sincere that finally nothing remains in the mind but the impression of its supreme purpose. The colloquialism is to a certain extent justified by the fact that he is addressing 'the man in the street.' The nature of some of the individual attacks, however, are not so easily justified, and cannot be regarded as other than a blot on a book concerned with the Love of God. The religious experience known as conversion must be judged by its fruits, of which uncharitableness cannot be one. But it is easy for the convert in his exaltation to forget that he is only on the first step of the way, and that to become 'perfect even as your Father which is in Heaven is perfect' is the task of a life-time — and possibly beyond — even for the saint.

The book has been associated with the Oxford Group Movement; it has been rumoured that Mr. Nichols is now a 'Grouper,' and has written it in consequence. But this is not so, for although he gives every credit to this remarkable Movement, and in the chapter *Crusaders of 1936* writes of his personal impressions and experiences of the Group, yet on p. 312 he declares:

> 'It is not through any "movement," or "group," or "revival" that a man is able to speak with assurance of the living Christ, but through the promptings of his own heart.'

Part I is devoted mainly to refutations of the agnostic's arguments, and the writer remains comparatively cool, the reader also, for refutation never carries so much weight as conviction. But Part II suddenly catches fire, and it is impossible to read to the end without admitting that for some reason, which is of course not far to seek, the reading of this book has been in the nature of a spiritual experience. The reason lies clearly in the writer's own passionate sincerity:

> 'My own experience is so overwhelmingly convincing that I cannot rest until I have passed it on' (p. 312).

He has succeeded; the conviction burns on every page.

* *The Fool Hath Said.* By Beverley Nichols. (Jonathan Cape. 1936. 7/6.)

The chapter *Christ and War* is an impassioned and convincing reply to the man who still believes that he can condone war and be at one and the same time a Christian. Neither is it without a certain humour:

> 'The profession of "army chaplain" is a grotesque contradiction in terms. An army in action is an instrument of hate . . . and a minister of Christ is an instrument of love. The phrase therefore is as illogical as "undertaker-entertainer" . . .' (p. 245).

He stresses the spiritual degradation of war:

> 'It is this aspect of modern war which Christ would, of course, most sternly condemn, the necessity for envy, hatred, and all uncharitableness, and the suppression of every decent instinct of pity and love' (p. 253),

and replies conclusively to those familiar pessimists who affirm that 'you can't change human nature,' saying plainly that

> '. . . those words are a direct affront to Christ . . . You *can* change human nature. No man who has felt in him the spirit of Christ even for half a minute can deny this truth . . . You *do* change human nature, your own human nature, if you surrender it to Him . . . Human nature *must* be changed, on an enormous scale, in the future, unless the world is to be drowned in its own blood. And only Christ can change it' (p. 272).

And finally — and this is the answer to those who insist that the fighting-instinct is ineradicable, and must find some outlet:

> 'For the lust for battle we have to substitute the lust for virtue—and no weaker word than "lust" will do to express the mentality of those who "hunger and thirst after righteousness." This may seem an impossible ideal for those who perpetually think in terms of millions. But for those who, like Christ, thought in terms of the individual soul, it does not seem impossible at all. And even if it did they would continue to fight for that ideal, saying like Luther, "*Ich kann nicht anders*" . . .' (p. 275).

Occasionally Mr. Nichols writes as a poet:

> 'Christ was in everything . . . the lily of the field and the wind in the branches, and the song of the thrush in summer. He was the wave, and the rock on which the wave was breaking, and the spray which drifted like flying petals against the grey sky. He was the earth, and the sky that stares at the earth and in the clouds He walked, though He left His footprints eternally on the dewy grass . . . (p. 229).

Such writing is reminiscent of the Syrian mystic, Kahlil Gibran. And when in his plea for the right kind of leisure he says:

> '. . . there would be . . . time to watch the unfolding of the leaves, time to watch their fading, from the first speck of gold to the final fall, time to ponder the significance, which is woven in these branches, of birth and life and death . . . There would be time, at last, to listen to God. To hear a voice in the wind that is not of this world and an echo from far distances, a whisper that comes from no human lips' (pp. 304-5),

we know that this is a beauty that can only be so expressed by the writer who has heard 'the voice in the wind that is not of this world.'

DALLAS KENMARE.

MODERN TENDENCIES IN WORLD RELIGIONS*

This book seeks to give, in little more than three hundred short pages, a survey of religious development during the twentieth century in India, China, Japan, Islam, Russia and Judaism. The author has directed American University Seminars on the subject, and quotes widely from periodicals as well as books, of which a list for further reading is appended. Except in the introductory chapters on 'change-producing factors,' the book does not set out to be more than a sifting and collation of these sources, and comparison and generalisation are left to the reader.

Several observations recur in each chapter, notably *à propos* of the impact of Western civilization upon India, China and Japan. The effects of this have been various. Irreligion and a radical reaction against sacerdotalism, the scarcely less radical re-formulations, and (inevitable counterpart) no less uncompromisingly 'fundamentalist' reassertions of ancient creeds, syncretism, far-reaching social changes (often of a markedly Christian character)—remarks on these recur in every chapter. The facts would have been brought out the more clearly by a more systematic and parallel arrangement than our author has given: as it is, the book is a little haphazard, which does not facilitate the task of comparing and assessing the main developments in this 'jazz of religions,' if we may transfer a phrase used of Japan to the subject-matter of the whole book.

But it must have been no easy task to compress the material into these limits, and scarcely a page is wasted. Of particular interest are the various liberal or 'modernist' movements such as the Brahma Samaj (p. 35) and the works of Prof. Radhakrishnan in India; the 'New Thought Movement' of China, and the Neo-Confucianism of Lin Boom Keng (of which names the first, not the last, is the surname); the reformed Buddhism of the monk Tai Hsu (p. 124), who claims that his 'is the only religion which does not contradict scientific truth,' and of Takakusu (p. 155) and others in Japan, who are not in the least concerned to find that much of their faith is unrelated historically to Gautama himself, or the modernist Islam of a Lord Headley and Khuda Buksh (p. 208); and, finally, the more familiar liberal Judaism which began in Germany as far back as 1844.

It is encouraging to notice how all these groups, the most vital if not the most influential in their respective environments, are moving towards ethical theism and ideals of freedom and brotherhood. Indeed the influence of Christianity is often, sometimes even naïvely, explicit. Gandhi's reverence for the Gospels and many of our hymns is well known, but even an Arya Samajist speaks of Ghandi as 'an Indian Christ'! (p. 46). Buddhism in China and Japan has, like the Arya Samaj itself, assimilated most of the methods of preaching and social service of Christianity (*cf.* pp. 156-7, 159-162). The Chalcedonian doctrine of the Two Natures is even applied by the Shintoist Dr. Kato to the Emperor of Japan (p. 150)!

Here we strike the most sinister and one of the most dominant notes of the book. Modern Shinto (which has become more of a state-cult than a religion, so that Christians and Buddhists cannot conscientiously object to joining in its nationalist demonstrations) believes that

> 'the League of Nations can only attain its real objective by placing the imperial family at its head, for to attain its objective the League must have a strong punitive force of super-national character, and this can only be found in the imperial family of Japan' (p. 149).

* *Modern Tendencies in World Religions.* By C. S. Braden, Ph.D. (Allen and Unwin. 1933. 10/-.)

One could wish that this last clause were true. But the book abounds with references to aggressive nationalism influencing and supplanting religion. The changed attitude of even liberal Jews towards Zionism is only one instance in point. And from this angle a hard knock is given by Dr. Schulman to the tendency noted above:

> 'The Jewish pulpit has become a soap-box from which to orate about Jesus. All this is indelicate and undignified, and shows a lack of Jewish moral and spiritual vitality' (p. 319).

It is a pity that the book appeared too soon to make the inclusion of a chapter on Germanism inevitable.

It seems clear that, despite the hopeful symptoms, the task of modern evangelism is as hard as it is vitally important. Much will depend on the attitude of the Christian missionary: in the next few decades it is to be hoped that the assimilative methods of *Christa Seva Sangh* and of Stanley-Jones' Ashram will be increasingly adopted, coupled with an insistence on the central core, and not on the frills, of the Gospels. Christianity has a big chance in the world to-day, and the perusal of this book, perhaps especially the illuminating account of the development in Russia, should help us to take that chance.

H. P. KINGDON.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman.*

THE CATHOLIC, COMMUNIST, MODERNIST.

SIR,

I shall hardly be suspected of any undue leaning to Communism — of which, indeed, I have supplied a radical and searching criticism in my *Is there a Catholic Sociology?* (S.P.C.K.). I am, hence, in all the stronger position to deprecate emphatically your editorial remarks in answer to Mr. Schiff. You are right indeed in writing that the Christian life is a matter of seeking first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness. But is righteousness any less applicable, or indispensable, in the sphere of politics and economics than in any other aspect of life? And are not a very large proportion of practising Churchpeople very comfortable people, socially and economically speaking? And do not the majority of them take for granted, and strenuously defend, the social system that provides them with their comfort—a system founded on grossly unequal distribution of wealth, and that a completely arbitrary inequality resting on no rational or ethical principles? And further, in a State in theory self-governing, and, in actual fact, at least potentially so, are we not all responsible for their injustices?

I submit that the situation is entirely parallel to the social abuses against which the Hebrew prophets thundered. If Isaiah had to preach to a modern congregation, he would, as likely as not, lead them out to the nearest slum and say, Repent of *that!* And it is difficult to think that either our Lord Himself or the leaders of the earliest Christian Church in Jerusalem would have taken any other line. Dean Rashdall declared trenchantly: 'The one thing which we can say with absolute confidence is that the present distribution of wealth, and the use made of the wealth which they call their own by most rich men, would have caused His strongest and most uncom-

promising denunciation' (*Conscience and Christ,* p. 156). Now the Dean was the greatest mind that has appeared in the ranks of Anglican Modernism. And his works are full of similar utterances, which cut clean against your unfortunate dicta. As Rashdall's 'own son in the Faith,' I would implore our Modernists in general to return to his social teaching.

To seek to identify Christianity with any particular clear-cut programme, or any one political party is a very different matter, and this I by no means defend.

My old friend, the Rev. Charles Jenkinson, is well capable of speaking for himself. But from what I know of his activities in the past, I should be surprised indeed to learn that he makes two so separate and water-tight compartments, as you seem to suggest, between his work as a citizen and his duties as a minister of the Word and Sacraments. Rather, I should surmise that his preaching of the Gospel constantly includes earnest exhortations to his hearers to use 'our municipal and political institutions' to the full for the essentially Christian purposes as he does himself.

N. E. Egerton Swann.

St. Paul's Church Vestry, Covent Garden, W.C.2.

[As the Editor was honoured by Dr. Rashdall appointing him executor of his religious and theological writings (published and unpublished), he is grateful to Mr. Egerton Swann for his commendation of the teaching of that truly great man. We believe ourselves to be in agreement with Dr. Rashdall's teaching. When Mr. Egerton Swann asserts that our Lord's preaching to-day would take people to the nearest slum and say, 'Repent of that,' we are not convinced. His Gospel was primarily characterized by *inwardness.* When asked to bid a man's brother to divide the inheritance with him, He declined with the retort: 'Man, who made me a judge or a divider over you?' What Jesus taught was the stewardship of wealth of which God is the owner, and His primary lesson was right personal relations to God and to our fellow-men. Many other Gospels are, in clerical circles, more popular to-day and, as many feel, more practical. This primary Gospel of Jesus is that which is not only the most needful, but the most practical of Gospels. No true, permanent, and progressive civilization can be securely based on any other foundation. In their zeal for economic, social, and political reforms, there is great danger of many of our younger clergymen forgetting this. As clergymen, let them give primary place to this exacting and difficult task. Aristotle defines man as 'a political animal': Jesus proclaimed him as 'a child of God.' Of course, man is both: but the teaching of Jesus about man is more fundamental and needful than the teaching of Aristotle. Each has its place in modern life, but the teaching of Jesus should be the primary teaching of the Christian Church. Specific policies of economic, social, and political reform are better reserved for and more influentially voiced on the platform, in the Press, in the municipal chamber, in Parliament, in the political club, than in the Christian pulpit. A study of the pulpit teaching of Dean Rashdall will support our contention. We could wish that the following six volumes of his sermons and lectures, *Conscience and Christ, Doctrine and Development, Christus in Ecclesia, Principles and Precepts, Ideas and Ideals, God and Man,* were studied by every ordinand and clergyman in the English Church.—Ed., *M.C.*]

SIR,

I am at a loss to understand the reference to myself in the December issue of the *Modern Churchman* (under the heading 'The English Parson' in 'Signs of the Times') as having led the way in making Leeds slum-conscious by acting 'not as a clergyman but as a citizen, through municipal and political institutions.' That I acted through municipal and political institutions is true: there was no other way of acting, to secure the results at which I was aiming. But most certainly I acted as a clergyman, and I had other parochial clergy openly supporting me as clergymen, amongst whom, I am happy to say, the membership of the Modern Churchmen's Union was not unrepresented. That anyone could imagine I was acting otherwise surprises me: and certainly my friend the Rev. Leonard Schiff, who was working in an adjoining parish to mine at the height of my practical activities, will have recognized that those activities had a theological basis which was never disguised, but, on the contrary, proclaimed from the nearest approaches to the house-tops open to me.

I believe Mr. Schiff is correct in his assumption that there are many members of the Modern Churchmen's Union — and not only amongst his fellow younger members — whose views are not dissimilar to those enunciated in his letter. The Modern Churchmen's Union is a small society, but it is doubtful if any similar theological society's membership contains so high a percentage of clergy whose social and political convictions are well known to be 'advanced.' That the views of these members find scant expression in the Union's official pronouncements is probably due to the fact that such members are usually busily engaged in other fields, and do not bother to try to pull any weight in the Union. Perhaps this is a pity, for can there be much doubt that the excellent work being done by many who would be graded, and who would grade themselves, under one or other of the various shades of 'Catholic' thought (and in particular by the admirably organised 'Christendom' group), will tend to the creation of the belief that only on the basis of 'Anglo-Catholic' theology can an intellectually satisfying Christian sociology be reared?

It is certainly lamentable that the Council of the Modern Churchman's Union, which, unlike the *Modern Churchman*, speaks officially for the Union, has dissociated the Union from the recently published *Doctrinal Basis for the claim of the Church to concern itself with the Social Order* (Industrial Christian Fellowship, *2d.*), a carefully compiled and far from extreme statement which one would have thought would meet with the approval of every Churchman not a social obscurantist.

CHARLES JENKINSON.

St. John and St. Barnabas' Vicarage, Holbeck, Leeds.
January 2nd, 1937.

[We are very glad to have received and to publish the above letter. Our statement in our December issue (p. 472) that the wonderful success of the Rev. Charles Jenkinson as a social reformer in Leeds was due to his acting, not as a clergyman, but as a citizen, through the 'municipal and political institutions' of that city, is, we believe, correct. Of course, we did not deny, nor do we think that there is even any suggestion that we denied, that his splendid social work is based upon his theology and is the product of his moral and spiritual convictions. Our own conviction, based upon a long personal acquaintance with him, is that Mr. Jenkinson is a pure Maurician of the most modern and the most practical type, and from those

days, many years ago, when we first knew him as a student at Ripon Hall, we have had the sincerest admiration for his unflinching loyalty to his convictions and the selfless quality of his practical devotion to them. From our personal knowledge of Mr. Jenkinson, and a cursory study of his excellent parish magazine, since its first publication, we are of opinion that whilst as Vicar of his united parishes he consistently and courageously taught the great moral and spiritual truths of the Christian religion, he did not use his parish magazine nor his parochial pulpit to expound particular types of political, social or economic theory, and the necessity, if we are Christians, of securing by revolutionary or other methods the practical realization of these theories in our modern communities.

Mr. Schiff wears his rue with a difference. In his letter, published in our December issue, he seems to identify the Christian religion with the realization of a 'classless community': with the elimination of individual subsistence upon 'unearned increment': with the use of 'coercion' as a necessity in the extension of social reform. He may be right or he may be wrong in his views, but our point is that, whilst the expression of such views by clergymen is permissible on the political platform, in the municipal chamber, in the public press or in private conversation, they ought not to be propagated in the Christian pulpit.

We do not believe that Mr. Jenkinson has used his pulpit in this way. This belief of ours is open to criticism and to confutation, and we should be very glad, in these pages, if Mr. Jenkinson would tell us how, in this connection, he has used the Christian pulpit and what have been the themes and methods of his public preaching. We think that such information might be of real use to many.

We agree entirely with Mr. Jenkinson as to the inadequately representative character of the Council of the Modern Churchmen's Union. Two classes of modern churchmen are inadequately represented on it: (1) the Liberal Anglo-Catholics, (2) Modernists engaged in religious and social work in our great industrial centres.

We should wish to see both classes adequately represented. The problem is how to secure this if their fellow-members will not be at the pains to nominate them; nor they, if elected, be at the pains to attend meetings of the Council. Years ago we advocated strongly that the Council should meet in various places, and not always in London, but we failed to carry our point. We also urged that the local branches should send representatives to the Council. This custom prevailed for a brief season, and to our regret was discontinued. We sincerely hope, as a means of extending the usefulness of the Modern Churchmen's Union, that its council, in the near future, will be made much more representative of modern churchmanship than it is at present. Let those who are not represented take active steps to secure what is their due and what all their fellow-members will wish them to possess.

We agree with Mr. Jenkinson that the Council of the Modern Churchmen's Union did make a great mistake in pointedly declining to give its support to the published recent declaration of the Industrial Christian Fellowship.—Ed. *M.C.*]

Sir,

I have just finished reading Mr. Schiff's letter in this month's issue of the *Modern Churchman*, and your comments thereon. Unless I am misunderstanding you both, it seems to me that you have two diametrically different ideas of what the phrase 'The Kingdom of God' means. You, I

gather, understand it in what I suppose is the Augustinian sense, as something 'apart' from the 'world,' and you are thus able to think of activities in 'politics and economics' as something apart from religion, or at least as something with which the parson is not directly concerned; he, on the other hand, would, I imagine, regard 'politics and economics' as the very stuff out of which the Kingdom is to be fashioned. Whether this makes him a 'socialist sentimentalist' I am not clear; nor am I quite certain what that phrase means, except that it sounds depreciatory.

One point I notice may be of some significance. The Churchwardens who wanted the 'College gentleman' for their Vicar were 'rustic'; Mr. Schiff writes from a big urban district. Is it possible that things are moving and outlooks are developing in these big aggregations in a way which inevitably seems strange, almost terrifying, to those who are mainly acclimatized to the older rural order?

Anyway, if anything is reasonably certain, it surely is that 'The Kingdom of God' was basic in the Mind of Christ, and it is urgently necessary that the full meaning of this expression, so frequently on His lips, should be explored — a task peculiarly suitable for members of our Union, who are by their very profession not averse from investigating 'new truth'; I therefore venture to suggest that you secure, for the next few numbers of the *Modern Churchman*, a symposium of views on this issue, including at least one contribution from a 'socialist sentimentalist,' and one, perhaps, if he is willing, from Professor Macmurray, whose approach would, I imagine, be definitely new to some members. Such a series would in addition form an excellent background to the discussions of the next Conference.

HAROLD C. SCOTT.

78 Mayfield Road, Sanderstead.
December 18th, 1936.

[Of course, the meaning of the phrase 'Kingdom of God' has been 'explored' by many New Testament scholars during the last forty years, but it would be hard to find any New Testament phrase upon which there is less agreement. We are grateful for our correspondent's suggestion and should value brief contributions defining 'the Kingdom of the Heavens' or 'the Kingdom of God' as presented in the New Testament.—ED., *M.C.*]

SIR,

With regard to the question of the attitude of clergy to social problems, it seems to me that because people went to one extreme when I was young there is no need to go to the opposite extreme at the present day. I think that it would be better to try and arrive at a satisfactory balance in these restless times. When I was an undergraduate, together with some other undergraduates I arranged for a Labour leader to speak at the College hall in Oxford, which, I was told, was the first time that such a thing had been done.

Undergraduates in those days had a way of creating a disturbance if they did not like the views expressed, and their views in those days were probably not the same as they are to-day. We decided to get a chairman who would command their respect, and we invited the Rev. Charles Gore of Pusey House to take the chair. He agreed to do so and the meeting was

an orderly one. In reading the life of Bishop Gore I find that his bishop was much displeased with him for having done so. That episcopal displeasure seemed to represent one extreme, and at the present day things seem tending to the opposite extreme. A bishop expresses socialistic opinions and says that the Christian view should be heard. What he means by the Christian view is his own view, which is quite different from that of the Bishop of Gloucester.

Whilst each bishop is entitled to his own view, I do not think it would be desirable for one bishop to say to another: 'My view is the Christian view. Yours is not.'

OSWALD YOUNGHUSBAND.

8 Gloucester Row, Clifton, Bristol.

December 17th, 1936.

THE MODERN CHURCHMEN'S UNION COUNCIL ELECTION, 1937.

SIR,

I shall be glad if you will kindly give publicity to the following official notice to members of the Modern Churchmen's Union.

By the Constitution the following elected members of the Council retire on the day of the Annual General Meeting in May, 1937, and are not eligible for re-election, *viz.*: — The Ven. Archdeacon W. M. Browne, Rev. J. F. Clayton, Hon. Gilbert Coleridge, Rev. Canon W. H. Mackean, Rev. A. F. Robson, Rev. Canon T. Guy Rogers, Rev. E. St. G. Schomberg, Rev. Canon V. F. Storr, Rev. H. J. Trueman, and Miss Dorothy Ward.

The following co-opted members of the Council retire at the same time, but are eligible for election, *viz.*:—Rev. K. G. Budd, Miss A. M. Ferguson, Rev. G. L. H. Harvey, Miss Hilda Hubbard, Rev. F. I. L. Rees, Mr. H. F. Walker, and Rev. J. L. Wilson.

All other members of the Council whose names are in the list published in this magazine continue to serve.

Ten members are to be elected to the Council this year, and the nominations of candidates must reach the Secretary not later than March 1st. The names must be proposed and seconded by members of the Union, and the consent of the nominees should first be obtained. If more than ten nominations are received, voting papers will be sent to all members of the Union.

The Annual General Meeting of the Union will be held on Thursday, May 27th, 1937.

T. J. WOOD,

Organising Secretary.

520 Grand Buildings, Trafalgar Square, London, W.C.2.

January 4th, 1937.